THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

64 Parliamentary Papers
Reference only

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
LIBRARY

620093

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_july-28-august-15-1876_231

HANSARD'S
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

39° & 40° VICTORIÆ, 1876.

VOL. CCXXXI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF JULY 1876,

TO

THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF AUGUST 1876.

Fifth and Last Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,"
23, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1876.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CCXXXI.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 28.

Page

The Judicature Act—Explanation, Lord Coleridge 1

The Disturbances in Barbadoes—Observations, Earl Granville, The Earl of Carnarvon 2

Parliamentary Agency—

Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion, That this House do agree to the Report of the Select Committee:—Debate *resumed* 3

After further short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 28.

Army (India)—Furlough and Retiring Regulations—Question, Colonel Jervis; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 5

Public Health—Impure and Deficient Supply of Water—Question, Mr. Brown; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 6

Oyster Fisheries—Herne Bay—Question, Mr. Pemberton; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley 8

The Great Western Railway Accident at Bourton—Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley 8

Navy — H.M.S. "Thunderer" — Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 8

Criminal Law—Constabulary Grants—Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 9

Elementary Education Bill [Bill 155]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 27th July*] 9

After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress.

Bishopric of Truro Bill [Bill 185]—

Order for Consideration, as amended, read 27

Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration,"—(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

[*July* 28.] Page

It being ten minutes before Seven of the clock, the Debate was *adjourned.*

The remaining Unopposed Business having been taken, and it being now Seven of the clock, the House suspended its sitting.

The House resumed its sitting at Nine of the clock.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

HARBOURS OF REFUGE—THE NORTH EAST COAST—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the great loss of life and property annually occurring to our shipping on the north east coast of England shows that there is a deficiency of adequate Harbour accommodation in that district; and this House urges on Her Majesty's Government the construction on that coast of a suitable Harbour of Refuge and for strategic purposes,"—(*Sir Eardley Wilmot,*)—instead thereof 27

After short debate, Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

BARBADOES—SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITION—Observations, Mr. E. Jenkins; Reply, Mr. J. Lowther:—Debate thereon 42

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn:* —Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

[House counted out.]

COMMONS, SATURDAY, JULY 29.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. R. Smyth 59

Elementary Education Bill [Bill 155]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress* 28*th July*] 60

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Thursday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 277.]

Bishopric of Truro Bill—Consideration. Adjourned Debate .. 72

After short debate, Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1874-5—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [18th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5):—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 72

After short debate, Debate *adjourned* till *Monday.*

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 31.

TURKEY—TREATIES OF 1856—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That this House, anxious for the welfare of the various races subject to the Ottoman Empire, and for an improved administration of their Government, is ready to support the measures which become necessary for upholding the Treaties of 30th March and 15th April, 1856,"—(*The Lord Campbell*) 74

After long debate, a question being stated thereupon, the previous question was put—"Whether the said Question shall be now put?"—*Resolved* in the *Negative,*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 31.

Page

Post Office — Telegraphic Communication in Cornwall—Question, Mr. Young; Answer, Lord John Manners 113

Criminal Law—Pontefract Magistrates—Case of Duggan—Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 114

Criminal Law — Cases of Lewis, Platt, and Lancaster—Remission of Sentence—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 115

Navy—Coroners in Naval Districts—Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Hunt 115

England and France — Extradition—Case of Nadal—Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 116

France and the United States — Reported Commercial Treaty — Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke 116

China — The Yunnan Mission — The Report — Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Mr. Bourke 117

British Honduras—Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 117

India—War Office Charges—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 117

West Coast of Africa—The Acting Administrator of the Gambia—Question, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther .. 118

India—Indian Finance—The Exchanges—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 118

China—Chinese Consul at Hong Kong—Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 119

West Coast of Africa—Disputes with Dahomey—Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 119

Mercantile Marine — Life - Saving Apparatus — Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley 120

Army (India)—Service of European Regiments—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 120

Sweden — The British Church at Stockholm—Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Mr. Bourke 121

Turkey and Greece—Proposed Settlement of Circassians—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Disraeli 121

Parliament — Business of the Session—

Moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina,"—(*Mr. Disraeli*) 122

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Turkey—The Insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina—Resolution—

Moved, "That this House is of opinion that Her Majesty's Government, while maintaining the respect due to existing Treaties, should exercise all their influence with the view of securing the common welfare and equal treatment of the various races and religions which are under the authority of the Sublime Porte,"—(*Mr. Bruce*) .. 126

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the words "opinion that" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is the duty of the British Government, as one of the Powers which, under the Treaty of 1856, guaranteed the independence of the Ottoman Empire, in any steps that may be taken with a view to the restoration of peace between the Ottoman Porte and her Slavonic provinces to obtain for those provinces adequate and effectual guarantees for good and impartial government irrespective of race or creed,"—(*Mr. Forsyth,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 1.

Page

SAT FIRST IN PARLIAMENT—William Richard Lord Harlech—Was introduced by virtue of a special limitation in the patent dated 14th January 1876, and sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother John Ralph Lord Harlech, and took the Oath.

Winter Assizes Bill (No. 200)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 225

Motion *agreed to:* — Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

ARMY—MOBILIZATION—Question, Observations, Lord Waveney; Reply, Earl Cadogan:—Short debate thereon 226

BARBADOES—Observations, The Earl of Carnarvon:—Short debate thereon 236

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 1.

POOR LAW—BATH BOARD OF GUARDIANS—Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 254

ARMY MEDICAL REPORTS—Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 254

LOCAL EXPENDITURE — PENALTY FOR NON-RENDER OF ACCOUNTS — Question, Mr. Smyth; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 254

FIJI—THE EPIDEMIC—Questions, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Hunt .. 255

EDUCATION—GRANTS TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—KEYNSHAM BRITISH SCHOOL —Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Viscount Sandon .. 256

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

EDUCATION — TEACHERS OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster; Reply, Viscount Sandon 258

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS IV. —EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART—VOTE I—PUBLIC EDUCATION—

(1.) £1,107,055, to complete the sum for Public Education in England and Wales.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to*}.. 260

(2.) £226,673, to complete the sum for the Science and Art Department.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 263

(3.) £80,447, to complete the sum for the British Museum (including Furniture, &c.) —After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 263

(4.) £1,400, to complete the sum for the National Portrait Gallery.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 265

(5.) £7,610, to complete the sum for the University of London.

(6.) £288,227, to complete the sum for Public Education in Scotland.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 266

(7.) £4,207,to complete the sum for the Board of Education for Scotland.

(8.) £13,754, to complete the sum for Universities, &c., Scotland.

(9.) £1,500, to complete the sum for the National Gallery, &c., Scotland.

(10.) £420,949, to complete the sum for Public Education, Ireland. — After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 269

(11.) £430, to complete the sum for the Commissioners of Education (Endowed Schools), Ireland.

(12.) £1,739, to complete the sum for the National Gallery, Ireland.

(13.) £1,731, to complete the sum for the Royal Irish Academy.

(14.) £3,587, to complete the sum for the Queen's University, Ireland.

(15.) £8,822, to complete the sum for the Queen's Colleges, Ireland.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Pollution of Rivers Bill [Bill 186]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration,"—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) 281

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*:)—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Original Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered*.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 13, to leave out the words "at a reasonable cost,"—(*Mr. Lyon Playfair.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill:"—Debate arising.

It being ten minutes before Seven of the clock, the Debate was adjourned till *this day*.

The House suspended its Sitting at five minutes to Seven of the clock.

The House resumed its Sitting at Nine of the clock.

IRISH POLITICAL PRISONERS—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the time has come when Her Majesty's gracious pardon may be advantageously extended to the prisoners, whether convicted before the civil tribunals or by courts martial, who are and have been for many years undergoing punishment for offences arising out of insurrectionary movements connected with Ireland,"—(*Mr. O'Connor Power*) 285

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 51, Noes 117; Majority 66.

Pollution of Rivers Bill [Bill 186]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [1st August] proposed on Consideration of the Bill, as amended; and which Amendment was, in page 3, line 13, to leave out the words "at a reasonable cost,"—(*Mr. Lyon Playfair.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill:"—Debate *resumed* 318

Question put, and *agreed to*.

Amendments made:—Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow*.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Secretary Cross*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 281] 318

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2.

PARLIAMENTARY AGENCY—RESOLUTIONS—

Moved, "That this House, having considered the Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Agency, is of opinion that it is desirable to lay down more definite rules respecting the practice of Parliamentary Agency and the regulation of the conduct of Parliamentary Agents,"—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) .. 319

Amendment proposed,

To leave out all the words after the word "That," in order to add the words "at this late period of the Session, and without further time for consideration of the Report of the Joint Committee, it is not expedient to delegate the powers of Parliament for the purpose of constituting Parliamentary Agency as a distinct profession,"—(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Page

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill [Bill 194]—

Order for Committee read :—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Richard Smyth*) 303

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Maurice Brooks,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After long debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 3.

LORDS LIEUTENANT—CHOICE OF MAGISTRATES—Personal Explanation, The Earl of Sandwich; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon 365

Gaslight and Coke Company Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^{a}" 367

Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("upon this day three months,")—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

After short debate, on Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 34, Not-Contents 21; Majority 13 :—*Resolved* in the *Affirmative.*

Bill read 3^{a} accordingly, with the Amendments, and *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

NORTH AMERICA—EXTRADITION—

Adjourned debate on the Motion of Earl GRANVILLE—"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for further Correspondence respecting Extradition," *resumed* (according to Order) 371

After long debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 3.

ARMY — CAPTAIN ROBERTS — 94TH REGIMENT — THE COURT MARTIAL—Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck 414

TREATIES RESPECTING NON-EUROPEAN COUNTRIES—HERTSLET'S "MAP OF EUROPE BY TREATY"—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 416

PUBLIC HEALTH — THE SHEERNESS SEWERS—Question, Mr. Pemberton; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 416

ARMY (INDIA)—ARREARS OF PAY—Question, Colonel Jervis; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 417

ARMY — CAPTAIN ROBERTS — THE 94TH REGIMENT—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 418

ARMY—THE MONCRIEFF GUN CARRIAGE—Question, Mr. Maitland; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil 418

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1872—MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 419

ARMY — THE AUXILIARY FORCES — THE BUCKS YEOMANRY—Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 419

[*August* 3.] Page

THE ROYAL MINT—THE NEW SITE—Question, Mr. Hankey; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 420

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS—LIGHT DUES—Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley 421

PUBLIC HEALTH — THE EAGLEY MILK EPIDEMIC — Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 421

ARMY—MILITARY PRISONERS—HANDCUFFS—Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 422

COMMERCIAL FRAUDS — LEGISLATION — Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 422

TURKEY—GUARANTEED LOAN, 1855—Question, Colonel Mure; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 423

UNITED STATES—EXTRADITION—RETURN OF CASES—Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Bourke 424

CRIMINAL LAW (IRELAND)—THE CONVICT KIRWAN—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 424

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) BILL—Observations, Sir Wilfrid Lawson 424

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Elementary Education Bill [Bill 277]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration,"—(*Viscount Sandon*) 437

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, principles have been introduced into this Bill since its Second Reading which were not then either mentioned to or contemplated by the House, which tend to disturb the basis on which Elementary Education now rests, to impede the formation of new schools, to introduce discord and confusion into the Election of School Boards, and to place the management of schools in the hands of persons who neither contribute to their support nor are elected by the ratepayers,"—(*The Marquess of Hartington,*)—instead thereof.

After debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 182, Noes 120; Majority 62.

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered:*—Amendments made.

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, line 17, after the word "pay," to insert the words "If the parent of any child who is resident in the district of a School Board is unable, by reason of poverty, to pay the fees of such child at a public elementary school, or any part of such fee, and if the School Board fails to make regulations, under Clauses twenty-five and seventy-four of the Elementary Education Act of 1870 for the payment of the same, it shall be the duty of the guardians, if satisfied of such inability, to pay the same in accordance with the provisions of this section,"—(*Lord Robert Montagu.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—After long debate, Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 4.

Juries Procedure (Ireland) Bill (No. 196)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 496

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

Poor Law Rating (Ireland) Bill (No. 197)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 499

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS FOR PAPERS—

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Despatch from the Government of India, 72 Public, of 24th December, 1874; Copies of any Dissents to the Despatches of the Secretary of State of 31st May 1876, recorded by Members of the Council of India,"—(*Earl Granville*) 499

After debate, Motion *agreed to*.

Then, an Address for Copy of reply to despatch from the Government of India, 72 Public, 24th December, 1874, being moved by the Marquess of SALISBURY, the same was *agreed to*.

EDUCATION—SCHOOLS—Question, Observations, Lord Aberdare; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon 513

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 4.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—UNION WORKHOUSES—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 515

METROPOLIS—HYDE PARK—ROTTEN ROW—Questions, Mr. Repton, Mr. Mellor; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith 516

RAILWAYS—ACCIDENT ON THE GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY AT BOURTON—Question, Mr. Goldney; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley .. 516

TREATIES RESPECTING NON-EUROPEAN COUNTRIES—HERTSLET'S "MAP OF EUROPE BY TREATY"—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke 517

Elementary Education Bill [Bill 277]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [3rd August]:—Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—Debate *resumed* 518

After long debate, it being after ten minutes before Seven of the clock, further proceeding on Consideration of the Bill was *adjourned* till *this day*.

And it being Seven of the clock, the House suspended its sitting.

The House resumed its sitting at Nine of the clock.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

REPORT ON THE FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS ACTS—POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTION—Question, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Answer, Mr. Tennant 550

Motion, by leave, *postponed*.

PARLIAMENT—ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 550

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn*:—Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow*.

Elementary Education Bill [Bill 277]—

Further Proceedings [4th August] on Consideration of the Bill, as amended, *resumed* 551

Amendments made:—Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow*.

Pollution of Rivers Bill [Bill 276]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a third time,"—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) 556

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill [Bill 96]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*The Lord Advocate*) 561

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is inexpedient to legislate on this matter without extending the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts,"—(*Mr. Anderson*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

Forfeiture Relief Bill [Bill 259]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 565

[House counted out.]

COMMONS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 5.

SCOTLAND—THE KING'S PARK AT STIRLING—Question, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 565

Elementary Education Bill [Bill 277]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a third time,"—(*Viscount Sandon*) .. 566

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 119, Noes 46; Majority 73.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

EGYPT—MR. CAVE'S MISSION—EGYPTIAN FINANCE—Observations, Sir George Campbell; Reply, Mr. Stephen Cave:—Debate thereon .. 615

INDIA—WAR OFFICE CHARGES—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is inexpedient to consider any more Estimates of this kind, until it is satisfactorily proved by proper statements as to how the funds previously advanced during the past five or six years by the India Office, on account of the Military charges defrayed by the War Office for India, have been used by the Treasury, whether in payment of War Office claims or in swelling the Revenue of the Kingdom,"—(*Sir George Balfour*,)—instead thereof 653

After short debate, Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

[*August* 5.] *Page*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £2,200, Mr. Cave's Mission to Egypt.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 655
(2.) £9,200, Suez Canal, British Directors.

Civil Service Estimates.

(3.) £129,922, to complete the sum for Public Buildings, Ireland.
(4.) £27,493, to complete the sum for the Privy Council Office.
(5.) £93,292, to complete the sum for Local Government Board, Ireland.
(6.) £10,098, to complete the sum for the National Gallery.
(7.) £12,400, to complete the sum for Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation. —After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 655
(8.) £163,163, to complete the sum for Diplomatic Services.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 656
(9.) £184,896, to complete the sum for Consular Services.
(10.) £13,243, to complete the sum for Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland.
(11.) £3,476, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances, &c., Ireland.
(12.) £170,000, Charges defrayed by the War Office on account of India.
(13.) £3,500, Science and Art Department Buildings.
(14.) £15,000, Metropolitan Police Courts.
(15.) £2,545, Burlington House.
(16.) £4,900, Edinburgh Arboretum.

Civil Service Estimates—Supplementary—Class V.

(17.) £35,000, Supplementary sum for Grants in Aid of Expenditure in certain Colonies.
(18.) £29,101, Duke of Leeds' Pension Commutation.
(19). £67,000, Supplementary sum for the Post Office.
(20.) £33,000, Supplementary sum for the Post Office Telegraphs.

Resolutions to be reported upon *Monday*.

Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [18th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5):—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 656
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Matter *considered* in Committee.

Resolutions *moved*, and, after short debate, *agreed to*; to be reported upon *Monday*.

Municipal Privileges (Ireland) Bill [Bill 39]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 661
Amendments made:—Further Proceeding *adjourned* till *Monday*.

Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill—

Motion for Leave (*The Solicitor General for Ireland*) 664
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill to amend the Laws relating to the jurisdiction of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions in Ireland, *ordered* (*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 286.]

Juries (Dublin) Bill—

Motion for Leave (*The Solicitor General for Ireland*) 664
After short debate, Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*,)—put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *Monday*.

WAYS AND MEANS—

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1877, the sum of £28,703,043 be granted, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday*.

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 7.

Cattle Disease (Ireland) Bill (No. 195)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 666

After short debate, Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

Bishopric of Truro Bill (No. 201)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 669

After short debate, Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

ARMY—THE RESERVES—ADDRESS FOR PAPERS—

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Papers showing why the conditions of service in the fifth paragraph of the Regulations for the Discipline and Payment of the Army Reserve, that the provisions of the Mutiny Act and Articles of War should apply to the Force whenever it is called out for training and exercise, were not carried out from 1871 to 2nd March 1876; and for any papers showing how many men of the 1st Class Army Reserve have been invalided,—(*The Lord Strathnairn*) 670

After debate, on Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative*.

Erne Lough and River Bill (No. 189)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 688

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* for *To-morrow*.

Ardglass Harbour Bill (No. 193)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 688

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* for *To-morrow*.

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 7.

AFRICA (WEST COAST)—NATIVE LABOURERS—AFRICAN MAIL STEAMERS—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 690

ARMY—MOBILIZATION — THE LONGFORD RIFLE MILITIA —Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 691

DOVER HARBOUR—Question, Mr. Freshfield; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 691

INDIA — BANDA AND KIRWEE BOOTY—Question, General Shute; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 692

THE RECORD OFFICE — DESTRUCTION AND SALE OF PUBLIC RECORDS—Question, Mr. W. Gordon; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 692

IRISH CHURCH TEMPORALITIES COMMISSION—NATIONAL MONUMENTS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 693

SPAIN—WAR TAXES IN CUBA—Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, Mr. Bourke 694

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT—Question, Mr. Massey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 695

OFFICE OF CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF WORKS — Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Disraeli 695

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL—LORDS' AMENDMENTS—Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Mr. Disraeli 695

[*August* 7.]

Page

Dunkeld Bridge Trust—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Lord Advocate 696

Army—Militia Surgeons—Compensation—Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 697

Criminal Law—Remission of Sentences—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 697

India Office Return—Question, Colonel Jervis; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 698

Army—Return of Arrears of Pay—Question, Colonel Jervis; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 698

Army—Purchase and Exchange—Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 699

Ports, Harbours, &c., United Kingdom—Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley 699

India—Leprosy—Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 700

Customs—Office of the Solicitor—Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. W. H. Smith 700

Turkey—The Geneva Convention—Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Mr. Disraeli 701

Barbadoes—The late Riots—Question, Mr. Thornhill; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 702

New Forest—Stony Cross Inclosure—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 702

Elementary Education Act, 1870—Cardiff School Board—Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, Viscount Sandon 703

Prisons (Scotland) Bill—Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 704

Parliament—Business of the House—Arrangement of Public Business—Resolution—

Moved, "That upon Tuesdays Orders of the Day have precedence over Notices of Motion, Government Orders having priority, and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays,"—(*Mr. Disraeli*) 704

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays,"—(*Mr. Butt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 99, Noes 45; Majority 54.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Supply—Report—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Report of Supply be now received:"—

Railway Accident—Reward to John Chiddy—Observations, Lord Elcho; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 712

Sweden—British Church at Stockholm—Observations, Mr. Beresford Hope; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross 714

Indian Civil Service Competition—Observations, Mr. Lowe; Reply, Lord George Hamilton 717

Turkey—The Reported Atrocities in Bulgaria—Observations, Mr. Anderson; Reply, Mr. Bourke:—Debate thereon 721

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions [August 5] *reported:*—First Seven Resolutions *agreed to.*

[*August* 7.] Page

SUPPLY—REPORT—continued.

On Eighth Resolution—

PERU—THE CASE OF THE "TALISMAN"—

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£163,163," and insert "£161,163," —(*Dr. Cameron*,)—instead thereof 746
Question proposed, "That £163,163 stand part of the said Resolution."—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.
Original Question put, and *agreed to*.
Subsequent Nine Resolutions *agreed to*.

On Eighteenth Resolution—

THE DUKE OF SCHOMBERG'S PENSION—COMMUTATION—

Amendment proposed, "That the said Resolution be not agreed to,"—(*Mr. Joseph Cowen*) 755
After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Resolution *agreed to*.
Remaining Resolutions *agreed to*.

WAYS AND MEANS—REPORT—Resolution [August 5] *reported* .. 758
After short debate, Resolution *agreed to*.

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 111]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 7th July*] 759
After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

Commons Bill—
Lords Amendments *considered* 773
Amendments, as far as the Amendment in page 22, line 33, read a second time, and *agreed to*.
Page 22, line 33, after the word "situate," to insert the words

"but the provisions of this section shall not apply to any commons or waste lands whereon the rights of common are vested solely in the lord of the manor,"

the next Amendment, read a second time.
Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment:"—The House *divided*; Ayes 47, Noes 18; Majority 29.
Subsequent Amendments *agreed to*.

Municipal Privileges (Ireland) Bill [Bill 39]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [5th August] proposed (on Consideration of the Bill, as amended), page 3, line 42, after the word "privilege," to insert the words "or to be selected to any corporate office:"—Debate *resumed* 774
After short debate, Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to*.
Another Amendment made:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

STANDING ORDERS REVISION—
Select Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 774

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*); *presented*, and read the first time .. 774

Winter Assizes (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Stacpoole*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 290] 775

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 8.

Page

Elementary Education Bill (No. 204)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 775

After debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Pollution of Rivers Bill (No. 207)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury*) .. 814

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Registration of Births and Deaths (Ireland) Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Donoughmore*); read 1ª (No. 208) 814

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 8.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT—SPECIAL WIRES—Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Lord John Manners 815

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENTS IN IRELAND—Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 816

CRIMINAL LAW—THE CONVICT CHRISTOS BAUMBOS—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 817

NAVY—THE NAVAL RESERVE—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Hunt 818

NAVY—RETIRED NAVAL COMMANDERS—Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Mr. Hunt 818

PUBLIC HEALTH—VACCINATION ACTS—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 819

TREATY OF VIENNA, 1815—THE POLISH LANGUAGE—Question, Mr. W. M. Torrens; Answer, Mr. Bourke 820

INDIA—THE KIRWEE BOOTY—Question, General Shute; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 821

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 821

PLUMSTEAD AND WORMHOLT COMMONS—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the action of the War Office with reference to Plumstead Common, in the county of Kent, and Wormholt Common, in the manor of Fulham, is such as to imperil the use of those open spaces for recreation by the people of the metropolis,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Suez Canal Shares Bill [Bill 189]—

Order for Committee read 831

After debate, Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

War Department Post Office (Remuneration, &c.) Bill [Bill 206]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on the War Department and Post Office (Remuneration, &c.) Bill):—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 856

War Department Post Office (Remuneration, &c.) Bill—continued.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Mellor,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 111]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 7th August*] 858

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Secretary Cross*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 291] 873

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9.

MILITARY PRISONERS—CASE OF GUNNER CHARLTON—Questions, Sir Edward Watkin; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 874

TURKEY — THE ATROCITIES IN BULGARIA—Questions, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Lowe; Answers, Mr. Bourke, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 875

EGYPT—MR. CAVE'S REPORT—Personal Explanation, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 877

CRIMINAL LAW—THE QUEEN v. CASTRO—THE TRIAL AT BAR—THE ORTON PORTRAITS AND PAINTINGS—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 878

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill [Bill 281]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 879

After short debate, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 111]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 879

After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

After further short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

Cruelty to Animals Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 250]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Assheton Cross*) 886

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "this day month,"—(*Dr. Ward.*)

After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

[*August* 9.] Page

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 221]—

Order for Committee read :—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Viscount Sandon*) 932

But, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 10.

Municipal Privileges (Ireland) Bill (No. 211)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Waveney*) .. 932

Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day month,")—(*The Earl of Limerick.*)

After short debate, on Question, "That 'now' stand part of the Motion?" their Lordships *divided;* Contents 41, Not-Contents 14; Majority 27 :—*Resolved* in the *Affirmative.*

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Elementary Education Bill (No. 204)—

House in Committee (according to Order) 937

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received *To-morrow;* and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 226.)

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill—

Order of the Day for considering the Commons Amendments, read .. 946

After debate, Commons Amendments *considered,* and *agreed to.*

Forfeiture Relief Bill (No. 210)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Limerick*) .. 963

After short debate, Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn,* and Order for 2ª *discharged.*

EGYPT—THE KHEDIVE AND THE NEW LEGAL TRIBUNALS—Question, Observations, Lord Emly; Reply, The Earl of Derby 964

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 10.

TURKEY—LOANS OF 1854 AND 1871—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 966

THE APPROPRIATION ACT—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 966

NAVY—THE SUPERINTENDENTS OF HER MAJESTY'S DOCKYARDS—Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Hunt 967

NAVY—DETERIORATION OF BOILERS—Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Hunt 968

CHANNEL ISLANDS—ROYAL COURT OF JERSEY—Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 968

AFRICA—THE GOLD COAST—CASE OF MESSRS. SWANZY—Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Bourke 969

PRICE OF GAS—Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley 969

ARMY—MILITIA SURGEONS—Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 970

THE WAR IN THE EAST—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Disraeli .. 970

CRIMINAL LAW—DIETARY OF MILLBANK PRISON—Question, Mr. Rowley Hill; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 970

[*August* 10.] Page

Army—Case of Lieutenant Walker—Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 971
Army—Commission on Retirement and Promotion—Questions, Captain Nolan, Sir Henry Havelock; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy .. 972
Church of England—Halifax Vicarage—Vicar's Rate—Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 972
Harbours of Refuge—Dover—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 973
Phœnix Park, Dublin—Questions, Mr. Butt, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 973
Indian Museum—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 974
Criminal Law (Ireland)—Trial of Claffey—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 974
Criminal Law—Police at Plymouth—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 975
Navy—Vestments of Navy Chaplains—Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, Mr. Hunt 976
Parliament—Business of the House—Questions, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Goschen; Answers, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Disraeli 977
The Extradition Treaty with the United States—Observations, Sir William Harcourt 977

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—

Bill *considered* in Committee 978

After short debate, Bill *reported*, without Amendment, to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

East India Revenue Accounts—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Lord George Hamilton*) 982

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House views with apprehension the constant additions which are made to the debt of India, and is of opinion that, considering the serious loss that has been caused, and may continue to be caused to India, by the depreciation in the value of silver, no new public works should be undertaken which would necessitate the raising of fresh loans; and that, in order to place the finances of India on a more satisfactory basis, the distinction which is now made between ordinary and extraordinary expenditure should be discontinued,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Matter *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1875 was £50,570,171; the charges in India, including the collection of the Revenue, Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £40,760,583; the charges in England (including £1,595,878, the value of Stores supplied to India) were £8,245,829; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £1,244,562, making a total charge for the same year of £50,250,974; and there was an excess of Income over Expenditure in that year amounting to £319,197; that the charge for Public Works extraordinary was £2,249,571, and that, including that charge, the excess of Expenditure over Income was £3,930,374.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

[*August* 10.] Page

Norwich and Boston (Corrupt Voters) Bill [Bill 244]—
Order for Committee read 1055
After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 11.

TURKEY—STATE OF BULGARIA—Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby 1059

MERCANTILE MARINE—THE "FRANCONIA" AND "STRATHCLYDE" COLLISION —MOTION FOR PAPERS—

Moved, That there be laid before the House, Report of Mr. Rothery, Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty, on the conduct of the officers of the "Palmerston" after the collision of the "Franconia" and the "Strathclyde,"—(*Earl Granville*) .. 1059
Motion *agreed to.*

PARLIAMENTARY AGENCY—
Resolutions *moved* (*Lord Redesdale*) 1061
Question put thereupon? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative*, and *Ordered* accordingly.

PARLIAMENTARY AGENCY—
Moved that the Chairman of Committees be authorised to enforce all the rules and orders of the House in relation to the conduct of the private business of the House and to the agents and solicitors engaged in prosecuting the same during any prorogation of Parliament,—(*The Lord President.*)
On question, *agreed to.*

PRIVATE BILLS—
Standing Orders 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 23, 26, 33, 34, 36, 38*a*, 43, 56, 58, 60, 62, 66, 67, 89, 104, 122, 123, 127, 133, 138, and 139 *considered*, and amended; and to be *printed* as amended,—(*The Chairman of Committees.*) (No. 232.)

Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment Bill (No. 218)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Earl Fortescue*) .. 1065
After short debate, on Question? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative;* Bill read 2^a accordingly.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 11.

POST OFFICE—TELEGRAPH MESSAGES—Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Lord John Manners 1068
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT — PUPIL TEACHERS — Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Viscount Sandon 1069
NAVY—ROYAL MARINES—LIGHT INFANTRY—Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Hunt 1069
MUSEUM OF SCIENCE (SOUTH KENSINGTON) — Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Viscount Sandon 1070
CRIMINAL LAW—THE QUEEN v. CASTRO—THE TRIAL AT BAR—THE ORTON PORTRAITS AND PAINTINGS — Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1071
PHŒNIX PARK (DUBLIN)—WHITEFIELD LODGE—Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1072
NAVY—H.M.S. "THUNDERER"—Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1072
IRISH FISHERY INSPECTORS—GUNBOAT—Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1073
COAL MINES—THE CLIFTON HALL COLLIERY ACCIDENT—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1074

INLAND REVENUE — RAILWAY PASSENGER DUTY—THE LONDON CHATHAM AND DOVER, AND THE LONDON BRIGHTON AND SOUTH COAST RAILWAYS —Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1075

LAW AND JUSTICE—THE QUEEN'S PROCTOR—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1075

NAVY — H.M.S. "VANGUARD"— Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt 1076

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT — Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1076

VISIT OF H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES TO INDIA — THE EXPENDITURE—Question, Mr. C. B. Denison; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1077

MIDLAND RAILWAY — THE RADSTOCK ACCIDENT — THE BLOCK SYSTEM—Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley 1078

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL TAXATION (IRELAND)—VALUATION—Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1078

Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill—

Order for Third Reading read 1078

TURKEY — THE ALLEGED ATROCITIES IN BULGARIA—Observations, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Reply, Mr. Bourke:—Debate thereon 1078

Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

Cruelty to Animals Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 250]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1147

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*.

LORDS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 12.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

COMMONS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 12.

JUDICATURE BILL (IRELAND)—COURT OF COMMON PLEAS—Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1153

EAST CLIFF AT DOVER—Observations, Major Dickson; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1154

PUBLIC HEALTH—VACCINATION ACTS—CASE OF JOSEPH ABEL—Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1155

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—EPISCOPAL SEE OF GIBRALTAR—Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1156

NAVY—H.M.S. "VANGUARD" — Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt 1156

NAVY—DESIGNS OF SHIPS OF WAR—Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt 1157

FIJI — THE LAND QUESTION—Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1157

ARMY — MILITARY ETIQUETTE — Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1158

PARLIAMENT — RELEVANCY OF DEBATE—THE APPROPRIATION BILL—Observations, Mr. E. Jenkins; Reply, Mr. Speaker:—Short debate thereon 1158

Merchant Shipping Bill—

Moved, "That the Amendments made by the Lords to the Merchant Shipping Bill be now taken into consideration" 1162

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month,"—(*Mr. Mac Iver.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" —After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Lords Amendments *considered*:—Some *agreed to*; some *disagreed to.*

Committee *appointed*, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed."

List of the Committee 1184

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 221]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th August], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on the Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill:) —Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 1185

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Baring,*) —instead thereof.

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Charley*:)—[The Motion was not seconded.]

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported*, without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

Irish Peerage Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 149]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1189

On Question, "That the Preamble be postponed?"

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna.*)

[House counted out.]

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 14.

Merchant Shipping Bill—

Commons Amendments to Lords Amendments, and Commons Reason for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to Order) 1190

After short debate, Message sent to the House of Commons, To acquaint them, That the Lords do not insist upon their Amendments to which the Commons disagree, and agree to the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords to the said Bill, with a consequential Amendment, to which they desire the concurrence of the Commons.

COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH ROUMANIA — Question, Observations, Lord Campbell; Reply, The Earl of Derby 1192

JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THIS HOUSE—ORDER—

Moved to resolve, "That this House do meet on Tuesday the 21st of November next for the purpose of hearing and determining Appeals and Matters connected therewith, pursuant to the provisions of 'The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876,'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Motion *agreed to*, and *ordered* accordingly.

[*August* 14.] *Page*

JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THIS HOUSE—

Standing Orders *moved* (*The Lord Chancellor*) 1194

Ordered, That the said Standing Orders be entered on the Roll of Standing Orders of this House.

Ordered, That the said Orders be printed and published, to the end all persons concerned may the better take notice of the same.

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 14.

LABOURERS' DWELLINGS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1197

PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1198

HYDE PARK CORNER—Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1199

PUBLIC HEALTH—SUPERVISION OF DAIRY FARMS—Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1199

PHŒNIX PARK (DUBLIN)—WHITEFIELD LODGE—Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1200

THE DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1868 — PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. 1200

INSPECTORS OF FISHERIES (IRELAND) — BYE-LAWS—Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1201

H.M.S. "MONARCH" AND "RALEIGH"—COLLISION—Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. A. Egerton 1202

TURKEY—THE LOANS OF 1854 AND 1855—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1203

METROPOLIS—ARTIZANS DWELLINGS ACT—LANCASHIRE COURT, BOND STREET—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 1204

POOR LAW (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Hope Johnstone; Answer, The Lord Advocate 1204

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS—FINANCE—Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1204

H.M.S. "THUNDERER"—Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1205

PUBLIC HEALTH—DRAINAGE AND WATER SUPPLY OF UPPINGHAM—RETURN OF THE SCHOOL—Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. 1206

GREECE—THE "AGRIGENTO" AND THE "HYLTON CASTLE"—Question, Mr. T. E. Smith; Answer, Mr. Bourke 1206

MERCANTILE MARINE—THE CASE OF HORATIO WALTERS—Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1206

Crossed Cheques Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 267]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General*) 1207

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now read the third time," in order to insert the word "re-committed,"—(*Mr. J. G. Hubbard.*)

After short debate, Question, "That the words 'now read the third time,' stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Question proposed, "That the word 're-committed' be there inserted."

After further short debate, Amendment proposed, to the said proposed Amendment to add, at the end, the words "in respect of Clauses 4, 5, and 12,"—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and *agreed to*:—Amendment, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *re-committed* in respect of Clauses 4, 5, and 12:—Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported.*

[*August* 14.] *Page*

Crossed Cheques Bill (*Lords*)—continued.

Moved, "That the Bill, as amended, be considered,"—(*Mr. Attorney General:*)—Question put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 8, to leave out from the word "had" to the word "payment," in line 13, inclusive,—(*Mr. Butt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 61, Noes 16; Majority 45.

Bill read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

Merchant Shipping Bill—

Lords' consequential Amendment:—Said consequential Amendment read by the Clerk at the Table 1222

Moved, "That the House agree with the Lords in the said Amendment," —(*Sir Charles Adderley.*)

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Elementary Education Bill—

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Moved, "That the Lords Amendments be agreed to,"—(*Viscount Sandon*) 1222

Motion *agreed to.*

PHŒNIX PARK (DUBLIN)—WHITEFIELD LODGE—MOTION FOR PAPERS—

Moved for "Copies of any Correspondence between the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland on the subject of letting Whitefield Lodge, Phœnix Park,"—(*Mr. Butt*) 1222

Motion *agreed to.*

Copies *ordered*, "of any Correspondence between the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland on the subject of letting Whitefield Lodge in the Phœnix Park:"

"Of any Minutes of the Commissioners of Public Works relating thereto:"

"Of the advertisement offering the lands for letting:"

"And, of any proposals made for the taking of the house and lands."

LAND TENURE (IRELAND)—ADDRESS FOR A ROYAL COMMISSION—

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She may be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the state of Land Tenure in Ireland and the condition of the occupiers of land,"—(*The O'Donoghue*) 1223

[House counted out]

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 15.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

The ROYAL ASSENT was given to several Bills; And afterwards HER MAJESTY'S SPEECH was delivered to both Houses by THE LORD CHANCELLOR.

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Tuesday the thirty-first day of October next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Tuesday the thirty-first day of October next.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 15.

Page

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM — GRATUITIES TO THE POLICE — Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1230

IRELAND—THE CORPORATION OF DUBLIN —Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1230

COMMON PLEAS (IRELAND) — RESIGNATION OF THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE — MOTION FOR A PAPER—

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Letter of Resignation of the late Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Ireland,"—(*Mr. Butt*) .. 1231

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

PROTESTS, TITLE AND CONTENTS, APPENDIX, TABLE OF STATUTES, &c.

TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

LORDS.

SAT FIRST.

Monday, July 31, 1876.

The Lord De Freyne, after the death of his Father.

Tuesday, August 1.

William Richard Lord Harlech—Was introduced by virtue of a special limitation in the patent dated 14th January 1876, and sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother John Ralph Lord Harlech, and took the Oath.

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

Saturday, August 5, 1876.

For *the Borough of Leeds*, *v.* Robert Meek Carter, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

Monday, August 7.

For *Carmarthen Borough*, *v.* Charles William Nevill, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.

Wednesday, August 9.

For *Rutland*, *v.* the Right honble. Gerard James Noel, First Commissioner of Her Majesty's Works and Buildings.

Monday, August 14.

For *Donegal*, *v.* Thomas Conolly, esquire, deceased.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

Friday, July 28, 1876.

Kent County (Eastern Division)—William Deedes, esquire.

Monday, August 7.

Borough of New Shoreham—Sir Walter Wyndham Burrell, baronet.

Tuesday, August 15.

Carmarthen Borough—Emile Algernon Arthur Keppell Cowell Stepney, esquire.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*,
APPOINTED TO MEET 5 MARCH, 1874, AND THENCE CONTINUED
TILL 8 FEBRUARY, 1876, IN THE THIRTY-NINTH YEAR OF
THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FIFTH AND LAST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 28*th July*, 1876.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee — Report*—Convict Prisons (Returns) * (179); Isle of Man (Officers) * (174).
Third Reading—Medical Act (Qualifications) * (184); Clean Rivers * (182), and *passed.*

THE JUDICATURE ACT.

EXPLANATION.

LORD COLERIDGE said, he wished to make a correction of what he stated upon this subject in last night's debate. He had been represented as saying that the arrears *in Banco* were 150 cases, whereas, in fact, they were only about 50. He remarked yesterday that at the sittings at *Nisi Prius* in London and Middlesex, during the legal year which was now drawing to a close, there were standing for trial 670 cases; but he found that the number was nearer 700. He desired to add in reference to the present number of arrears of causes standing for trial being "unprecedented" that he remembered that in the Court in which he now had the honour to preside there were not long ago at the Guildhall sittings alone 348 causes standing for trial. Consequently, it was incorrect to say that the present state of things was unprecedented.

THE DISTURBANCES IN BARBADOES.

OBSERVATIONS.

EARL GRANVILLE: I wish to make a remark respecting the Second Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon), who is about "to call attention to the Parliamentary Papers relative to the recent disturbances in Barbadoes." I do not like to raise any objection to the noble Earl taking the same course which I myself took the other day, and which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack then objected to. I would, however, remark that the Papers on this subject have only been for a very short in your Lordships' hands, and I regret to say that my noble Friend (the Earl of Kimberley) who wished to take part in the discussion is in bed with a sore throat. In these circumstances, I trust the noble Earl will find it convenient to postpone his Motion.

The Earl of CARNARVON: I feel some little difficulty, now that the Session is drawing so near to an end, in postponing the discussion of the question. But I have heard with great regret of the illness of my noble Friend (the Earl of Kimberley). I know the interest he takes in this matter, and the way in which he is concerned in it, for he has been more or less a party to the transactions mentioned in the Blue Book. I have no hssitation, therefore, in agreeing to the proposal of my noble Friend opposite, and I will postpone the discussion of the question to the next open day—which day I will fix when I have seen that my noble Friend (the Earl of Kimberley) is restored to health.

PARLIAMENTARY AGENCY.

Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate, on the Motion, That this House do agree to the Report of the Select Committee.

Debate *resumed.*

Lord REDESDALE again insisted on the importance of having a qualified and recognized body for the transaction of Parliamentary business. He did not at all assent to the recommendation of the Petition of the Incorporated Law Society as to members of the legal Profession. Formerly the business of Parliamentary Agents was transacted by officers of the two Houses, and it was done most efficiently, and the fees which were awarded for the work were not considered as being more than sufficient for the purpose, and the evidence of Sir Theodore Martin, who represented the Parliamentary Agents, showed that the division of fees between the solicitors and Parliamentary Agents was most objectionable. He (Lord Redesdale) hoped that under all the circumstances their Lordships would agree with the recommendations of the Joint Committee of both Houses. Under the present system he and other Officers of the House had an influence over Parliamentary Agents, and nothing tended so much to the maintenance of due order in the discharge of the Business than that they should have the assistance of qualified Parliamentary Agents.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that after the time which had elapsed since the subject had been brought under the notice of the public he had no wish to place himself in a position of antagonism with reference to it to his noble Friend, by whom the Private Business of the House was conducted with so much efficiency and wisdom. He had received numerous communications in reference to the Report, almost all of which were directed to the point of the division of profits between the Parliamentary Agents and their solicitors. His noble Friend said that Sir Theodore Martin and the Parliamentary Agents seemed to think the division of profits very objectionable, and if he (the Lord Chancellor) were a Parliamentary Agent he would probably be of the same opinion, because if they were not divided the Parliamentary Agents would get the whole. His noble Friend had not heard what the Law Societies of London and Liverpool had to say on the other side; and if it was a perfectly well-understood thing, as it was, that between the country and the town solicitors there might be a division of fees, he could see no good reason why there should not be a similar division between country solicitors and Parliamentary Agents. There was besides the difficulty, or rather the impossibility, of enforcing any rule which might be made on the subject; for if it were deemed desirable by those concerned that the profits should be divided, a way of doing so would readily be found.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN observed there was no analogy between the case of the country solicitor and his town agent, and that of the country solicitor and the Parliamentary Agent. In the one case only one set of fees was allowed—in the other two sets were allowed. What the country solicitor now asked was to be allowed not only to receive his own charges, but to share in the charges of the Parliamentary Agent.

The Order of the House could be easily enforced by striking off the list of Agents any one who contravened it.

Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 28th July, 1876.

MINUTES.]—NEW MEMBER SWORN—William Deedes, esquire, *for* the Eastern Division of the County of Kent.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Police (Expenses) Act Continuance* [268].

Report of Select Committee—Metropolitan Gas (Surrey side) [No. 384].

Committee—Elementary Education [155]—R.P.

Committee—Report—Savings Banks (Barrister)* [269]; Slave Trade* [270]; Saint Vincent, Tobago, and Grenada Constitution* [253]; Pollution of Rivers (*re-comm.*)* [272-276]

Third Reading—Juries Procedure (Ireland)* [261]; Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates)* [263]; Winter Assizes* [245]; Poor Law Rating (Ireland)* [156], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Metropolis Gas (Surrey Side)* [204].

The House met at Two of the clock.

ARMY (INDIA)—FURLOUGH AND RETIRING REGULATIONS.—QUESTION.

COLONEL JERVIS asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether, as in accordance with the Furlough Regulations of 1796, medical officers of the Indian Army who had served a period of twenty years or upwards were entitled to reckon three years' furlough to Europe out of such period towards service for pension, and that by the Furlough Rules of 1868, Ch. 3, rule xxxiv., published by the Government of India, 10th November 1868, No. 1064, those officers were informed that—

> "If an officer under the Furlough Rules of 1796 elects the present rules, his service for pension will be reckoned under the former rules up to 1st July 1868, and thenceforward under the rules of 1868"

—in consequence of which statement many officers did elect such Furlough Regulations of 1868 for the remainder of their service—he can explain the alteration made in Rule xxxiv. of the Regulations of 1868, republished by the Government of India 25th February 1874, No. 171, that—

> "All periods of leave out of Indian limits taken previous to 1st July 1868 will be wholly excluded from his service for pension,"

and, how it came to be made retrospective in regard to those who had elected on the faith of the rules as published in 1868?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, the Indian Army furlough regulations and retiring regulations are two distinct things. Under the retiring regulations of 1796 a certain minimum of years' actual service in India was required, and leave to Europe did not count as actual service in India. For instance, a man who had served 20 years, of which 17 were actual service in India, could retire upon a pension, not because he had 20 years' gross service, but because he had served 17 years actually in India. Under the furlough rules of 1854 and 1868 more favourable conditions were granted to officers, and a certain amount of leave of absence according to length of service was allowed to count "as actual service in India." An officer who, being under the furlough rules of 1796, elected the rules of 1868 would be in this position as regards pension—up to 1868 only his actual service in India would count towards pension, after 1868 a certain amount of leave of absence, according to his rank, would count as actual service in India. The question is rather a complicated one; but no alteration has been made in the rules of 1868, and the notice merely explains a previous notice.

PUBLIC HEALTH—IMPURE AND DEFICIENT SUPPLY OF WATER.

QUESTION.

MR. BROWN asked the President of the Local Government Board, If his attention has been directed to the polluted condition of the water supply for domestic purposes in some of the rural parts of the Country, and what step he has or intends to take to remedy the evils?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, he was sorry the hon. Gentleman had been prevented the other evening from bringing that very important subject under the notice of the House, as he should then have been glad to reply to him in greater detail than he should be permitted to do in answer to a Question. His (Mr. Sclater-Booth's) attention had undoubtedly been directed to the polluted condition of the water supply in some rural districts of the country—first, by the great distress occasioned by the Water Famine in 1874; secondly, by the constant Reports he had received as to the mischief arising from the inadequate supply of water and its polluted condition in some parts of the country; and thirdly, by a deputation of a very influential and important character, introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair). That deputation desired that the Government should appoint a Royal Commission on the subject. The matter had been very carefully considered, but they had come to the conclusion that no Royal Commission was necessary, as already they possessed ample information. The hon. Gentleman asked what steps he (Mr. Sclater-Booth) had taken or intended to take to remedy the evils. He had passed two Bills through Parliament on the subject, in each of which greater facilities had been given to authorities both rural and urban for the supply of water. In 1874 powers were given for the purchase of water rights, and in 1875 those powers were increased; the sanitary authority being enabled to acquire those rights outside his district with a view to conduct water purchased elsewhere to places within their district. The rural sanitary authorities were rapidly awakening as to the necessity of exercising those improved powers. In the year 1873 no larger sum than £1,992 was sanctioned by the Local Government Office to be raised by loan in the rural districts; in 1874 that amount had increased to £16,628; in 1875 to £31,274; and in the current year, so far as it had gone, £23,000 had been sanctioned to be raised for the same purpose. These sums were large relatively to the necessities of different localities, some of which required only two or three hundred pounds. Further, he had framed and introduced the Pollution of Rivers Bill—the effect of which would be to give pure water to many rural districts. The amelioration of the condition of the large rivers would be a matter of more gradual progress.

OYSTER FISHERIES—HERNE BAY.

QUESTION.

Mr. PEMBERTON asked the President of the Board of Trade, What course he intends to adopt with reference to the Reports of Mr. Walpole on the Herne Bay Oyster Fishery?

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY: Sir, I have, as the hon. Member is aware, deferred action in the matter of the Herne Bay Oyster Fishery pending the sitting of the Select Committee on Oyster Fisheries. Now that their Report has been presented, I have directed notice to be given to the Herne Bay Company that on the 30th of September next the Board of Trade will issue a certificate in accordance with the recommendation contained in Mr. Walpole's Report.

THE GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY ACCIDENT.—QUESTION.

Mr. HAYTER asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether he has any information to give to the House respecting this accident; and whether, considering that this is the second fatal accident that has occurred to this train, he will consent to lay upon the Table the Report of Captain Tyler when it is made?

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY: I have no information, Sir, to give the House about the Bristol accident beyond what has appeared in the papers. As soon as the news arrived Captain Tyler was telegraphed to go immediately to the spot, and I have a telegram from him that he went accordingly. The railway company sent me information, but nothing in addition to or differing from what the newspapers have given. I will lay before the House the Report I have got.

NAVY—H.M.S. "THUNDERER."

QUESTION.

Mr. GRIEVE (for Mr. Anderson) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If, in addition to the assistance of experts, he has arranged to allow the Gosport Coroner the expense of legal aid in the "Thunderer" case, so as to secure a complete and impartial inquiry?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that, as it had been found impracticable to arrange for the holding of the inquest by any other person than the County Coroner, he had consulted his Colleagues as to the best course to be adopted, and it had been determined to place funds at the disposal of the Coroner to enable him to secure the attendance of a legal assessor, in addition to the professional assistance already granted as far as regarded a scientific knowledge of boilers. That had been communicated by letter to the Coroner, but with a notification that the choice of the assessor must lie entirely with him, so that the Government might have nothing to do with the inquiry.

CRIMINAL LAW—CONSTABULARY GRANTS.—QUESTION.

MR. WHITWELL asked the Secretary to the Treasury, How much money has been granted under the 38 and 39 Vic., c. 48, above the amount expended on the constabulary for the previous year?

MR. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that, so far as he could at present ascertain, the amount expended in the financial year 1875-6 was £1,205,245, and the grants for the present year 1876-7, were £1,241,472, showing an increase of £36,227.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

[BILL 155.]

(*Viscount Sandon, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 27th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. RATHBONE moved, in page 5, after Clause 12, to insert the following Clause—

(Conditions of contribution to day industrial schools.)

"The conditions of a Parliamentary contribution to a certified day industrial school shall conform to the standards for the time being in force for the purposes of a Parliamentary Grant to public elementary schools; but they may vary the amounts of the contributions to be made in respect of such standards respectively.

"Any conditions made by a Secretary of State for the purposes of contributions to a day industrial school shall be laid before Parliament in the same manner as minutes of the Education Department."

New clause (Conditions of contribution to day industrial schools,)—(*Mr. Rathbone*)—*brought up*, and read a first time.

On Question, That the clause be now read a second time?

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR said, he was requested by his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), to state to the Committee that he thought this would be a very good and useful clause. One defect of the present system was the want of similarity between the education given in industrial schools and in ordinary schools. The clause would give some security that these industrial schools would be used not only as refuges, but for the purposes of education.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, he should be glad to accept the clause of his hon. Friend, both because he understood it met his views and the wishes of hon. Gentlemen opposite, who had given much thought to this question, and because he thought some such provision was desirable, as he was himself anxious that a strict hand should be kept over these schools, so that they should be as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh had said—*bonâ fide* educational establishments, and not merely refuges for neglected children. It was possible, however, that the clause would need, on further consideration, some alteration in its wording; if so, it must be understood that he was free to make it on the Report.

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH, whilst assenting to the clause, must counsel the House to exercise the greatest caution in the matter. He must repeat, he was greatly afraid that these schools would be abused and would involve the country in great expense.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, said, he was of opinion that the wording of the clause would not carry out the intention of the Mover.

Question put, and *agreed to*.

Clause read the second time, and *added* to the Bill.

MR. SHAW-LEFEVRE moved, in page 11, after Clause 29, to insert the following Clause:—

(Religious education in schools supported mainly by Parliamentary grants and school fees.)

"Wherever in any school the income derived from voluntary contributions and endowments shall not, on the average of two successive years, amount to one-sixth part of its total income, including the school fees and the Parliamentary grant, the Education Department shall give notice to the managers of such school that it shall thenceforward be a condition of any Parliamentary grant to such school that no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any religious denomination shall be taught in such school, and from the date of such notice no Parliamentary grant shall be made by the Education Department to such school unless such condition is fulfilled."

The clause he had to submit appeared to be a necessary consequence, he might say a logical consequence, of the clause which the noble Lord added to the Bill last week, by which all restriction upon the Parliamentary grant to denominational schools was removed up to the extent of 17*s.* 6*d.* That clause was, in his opinion, a most serious departure from the principle of the arrangement of 1871. The principle of that arrangement was clearly laid down by his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) in 1870, and was as follows:—"First, that the grant from the Education Department should be given only for secular results; and, secondly, that under no circumstances should the public grants be allowed so to operate as entirely to supply, together with the school pence, the sum necessary to support those schools, without there should always remain a void which must be filled up from private contributions, and without which, failing other sources of assistance, those schools would no longer deserve the character of voluntary." With this object the restriction upon the Parliamentary grant was inserted in the Act of 1870, which had now been repealed by the noble Lord. The restriction did not appear to have been wholly successful, as certain free schools had been enabled to escape through it, but their number was so inconsiderable that they might be neglected. Now, the effect of the noble Lord's clause, started upon the Committee at the last moment, would be enormously to increase the number of schools, which being called voluntary, and which being really denominational, would in future be wholly supported by Parliamentary grants or by school fees, and which would be able wholly, or nearly so, to dispense with private subscriptions. The object of his clause was to provide that such schools, when they ceased to be voluntary in the sense that they were no longer supported by private contributions, but were dependent, wholly or mainly, on State aid and school fees, should be no longer entitled to the privilege of a voluntary character; that they should no longer be permitted to be denominational, but that they should come under the operation of the clause in the Act of 1870, which applied to board schools, and which went by the name of his right hon. Friend the Member for South Hampshire (Mr. Cowper-Temple), and that they should be compelled to be undenominational. Before, however, he dealt with the argument in favour of this course, he must be permitted to say a few words in proof of the statement he had made that the result of the noble Lord's clause would be to enable a large number of schools to dispense with voluntary contributions. In the first place, he must remind the House of what they were doing by this Bill. The object and purport of the Bill was to fill the empty benches of the denominational schools throughout the country, and especially in the rural districts. As a rule, these districts were now fairly supplied with schools. The schools were there, the teachers were there, but the benches were half empty. By the compulsory clauses of this Bill they hoped to add at least one-third to the number of children in average attendance at these schools. But if they added one-third to the number of children in average attendance, they would increase the Parliamentary grant and the school fees by one third. Then, again, they had given power to the Guardians to pay the school fees for parents who were too poor to do so. They had left to the managers the full power to raise the school fees, and this, coupled with the compulsory powers of attendance, would undoubtedly enable the managers to screw up the school fees. During the last five or six years already there had been a tendency to screw up the school fees, and in Church schools they had risen from an average of 7*s.* 11*d.* to 9*s.* 2*d.* Lastly, they had done away with the restriction upon the Parliamentary grant up to 17*s.* 6*d.* The present average grant on attendance was 12*s.* in Church schools; those who were better acquainted than he was said that it might fairly be expected that the grant would rise to 15*s.* What he said was, that the joint operation of all these measures would be enormously to increase the financial resources of the denominational schools, and to render a great proportion of them practically independent of voluntary contributions. Let him take an average Church school in a rural district. Five years ago such a school relied in about equal proportions on the Parliamentary grant, school fees and voluntary subscriptions, and each of these amounted to about 8*s.* per head on the average attendance. During the past five years the Parliamentary grant had already risen greatly in proportion to the other two, and the school pence had also risen. The present proportions were, voluntary subscriptions, 8*s.* 4*d.*; the school fees, 9*s.* 2*d.*; and the Government grant, nearly 12*s.* If they added one-third to the school fees and to the Parliamentary grant, they would obtain a sum of 7*s.*, which was nearly the amount of the voluntary subscriptions, and with the increased Parliamentary grant, and with the power of raising the school fees, would practically dispense with the necessity for subscriptions in a large number of schools. Another way of looking at it was this—the total amount of the voluntary subscriptions for all the voluntary schools was £470,000. If the compulsory powers of this Bill were successfull, and if the average attendance in rural schools was raised to the same level as at Leeds and Birmingham, 600,000 children would be added to the average attendance in the rural schools, and 600,000 children meant an addition to the revenues of the denominational schools of £240,000 in school fees, and £330,000 to the Parliamentary grant, a total of £570,000, without any consideration of the addition to the grant by the removal of the restriction or the possibility of increasing the fees. He contended, therefore, that it was clear beyond all question that the resources of the denominational schools would be vastly increased by the Bill, and that a very large proportion of them would be able to dispense with voluntary contributions. It seemed to him that voluntary schools could claim a title to the name on two grounds—First, if the attendance was voluntary; Secondly, if they were supported by voluntary contributions. And so long as they were voluntary in this sense, they were entitled to teach what dogmas they thought fit; and it might be worth while for the State to assist them in teaching secular subjects. But when they ceased to be voluntary in either sense, when attendance was compulsory, when they no longer relied mainly on voluntary contributions, they were no longer voluntary schools in any true sense of the term, they were practically State schools; they ought to be subject to State control; the State could not support them without being responsible for the religious doctrines taught in them; and for the same reason which had induced Parliament to forbid the teaching of any catechism or dogmatic theology in the board schools, it ought to interfere with the religious teaching of these schools. He had always felt it most difficult to justify the proposal to compel Nonconformists to send their children to schools of a denominational character, even when such schools were supported by voluntary contributions; but how vastly increased the grievance was when these schools were wholly or mainly dependent on State aid and on school fees. He asked hon. Members whether they could expect that this system could last, or whether it would not give rise to an agitation to which that against church rates alone would compare. What he proposed was to provide beforehand for such cases — to deal with so-called voluntary schools, which might hereafter cease to be really voluntary schools, in the same way as board schools were now dealt with, and to provide that where the subscriptions did not amount to one-fourth part of the total income of the school, the Cowper-Temple Clause of the Act of 1870 should at once apply to the school, and that it should be a condition of the Parliamentary grant that no dogmatic theology should be taught in such schools.

Clause (Religious education in schools supported mainly by Parliamentary grants and school fees,)—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

VISCOUNT SANDON observed that there was one fundamental error in the statement of the hon. Gentleman, a statement he had often to contest—namely, that the Bill would apply principally to rural schools. ' It would not, and for this reason — that the attendance was rather better in the country than in towns, as he had shown over and over again; and the hon. Gentleman entirely overlooked what he had often called attention to before—namely, that the voluntary schools had a great claim to be considered in a different category from the board schools, not only because they received no aid from the rates, but because their supporters gave their invaluable voluntary management and oversight, and, even if there were no annual subscriptions, there was virtually a large voluntary contribution in the buildings themselves, on which a sum—estimated at about £13,000,000 sterling—had been spent from voluntary sources, besides the cost of annual maintenance and repair—the State having contributed less than £2,000,000. Again, the proposed change would affect board and voluntary schools exactly alike, and it should be remembered that there were a large number of struggling board schools in various places where the pressure of the education rates was much complained of, owing to the requirements of recent legislation and of the Department. With respect to the proposed clause, he would remind the hon. Gentleman that last night he announced, on the part of the Government, that they would not interfere in any way with anything that touched upon the religious question, and that announcement had been cordially received by both sides. The clause now proposed involved the religious question, because it would alter altogether the conditions of the Conscience Clause and of the Cowper-Temple Clause. Her Majesty's Government considered the religious question outside the four corners of the Bill, and he must, therefore, while prepared to answer the arguments of the hon. Member, adhere to the determination he had so expressed.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, that the noble Lord had a perfect right to pledge the Government to any particular course; but he had no right to say that on that side they ought not to propose or discuss any clause which they regarded as following legitimately from Amendments or clauses which had been already agreed to, even if it did touch upon the religious question. The Government had by the 13th clause of the Bill virtually given up voluntary schools. They would become mere adventure schools, supported by Government subventions. That clause would have a most corrupting effect upon the localities, the schools would be converted into State schools, and he thought that the children in such schools had a right to protection under the Cowper-Temple Clause.

Sir EARDLEY WILMOT said, that the working men of Warwickshire had a strong feeling with respect to religious teaching, and prized nothing more dearly than the reading of the Holy Scriptures. He could not support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Reading, but protested against the decision of the Government to exclude religious teaching from their consideration, as he was of opinion that all education would be worse than useless if the youth of this country were not taught their duty to God as well as to man.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that for different reasons than those assigned by the hon. and learned Baronet the Member for South Warwickshire (Sir Eardley Wilmot), he could not support the clause. Its effect would be to deny religious instruction to the poor schools and give it to the rich. The noble Lord the Vice President of the Council (Vicount Sandon) had, in the proposal, an excellent opportunity here offered him of injuring his enemy the Nonconformist, by accepting the clause and then laying the blame upon the hon. Member for Reading, for he (Lord Robert Montagu) believed that the majority of the British and Nonconformist schools would suffer from its adoption.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he could not accept the declaration of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council, that the decision to which the House had come on the previous night with respect to religious teaching was highly satisfactory to that House. Were those who insisted upon the reading of the Holy Scriptures to be treated as adopting a formulary? He did not like the manner in which they were proceeding. They were proceeding in the dark. What would be the result of giving State aid to denominational schools, without any guarantee on the part of the Government as to what the definition of "denominational schools" would be? It would be equal to concurrent endowment. He was not prepared to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Reading, although he thought it went a good way in the direction of solving the difficulty that had arisen upon the subject. He regretted that the clause of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford was not accepted. He was not indifferent to the value of the blind principle of compulsion in places where there might be only one school; but, as an advocate of religious liberty, he thought that in such cases some guarantee should be afforded that no religious teaching should be forced on the child contrary to the convictions of the parent.

MR. RICHARD supported the clause of the hon. Member for Reading. The objection which the Nonconformists had to sending children to denominational schools not subject to the school boards was that they were liable to be taught the Church Catechism. He did not wish to speak with disrespect of any formulary which had been adopted by any religious Body; but whatever might be the feeling of hon. Gentlemen opposite with respect to the teaching of the Church Catechism, the Nonconformists had a strong feeling against such teaching being forced upon their children. The answers returned to a circular issued by Mr. Bousted to about 300 Nonconformists of all denominations in Wales, showed that the feeling against the teaching of the Church Catechism was overwhelming. They believed that it taught a priestly and sacramental form of religion.

MR. FAWCETT deprecated the "cavalier" way in which the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council had treated the able speech of the hon. Member for Reading. The Opposition had not raised the point under discussion, it was the Government who had forced it upon hon. Gentlemen upon that side of the House. They had a right to demand that there should be some guarantee that the religious education to be given in schools which had ceased to be voluntary, should be the same as when they were really voluntary. He contended that unless the Amendment were accepted the clause would, as had been observed by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), practically establish concurrent endowment. The hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) would never have thought of bringing forward his clause, if the Government had not absolutely and fundamentally altered the principles and conditions on which voluntary denominational schools should exist in future. The object of the Bill was not simply to establish the principle of compulsion, but to give additional assistance to voluntary denominational schools. But by Parliamentary grants you virtually gave them a public character, and the object of the Amendment was, that where a school was supported by the public money, it should not be allowed to teach peculiar religious Catechisms or formularies. That was a true principle, and he would support it. Any institution, be it a school or anything else, which was supported by public money, ought to have public management forced upon it.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he was quite aware that at present some few schools were supported partly by fees and by grants, but these schools were dealt with as school-board schools, and it could not but be expected that if the Government proposed to turn voluntary schools into State schools, that there should be a demand for State management. The Government made no answer to that argument last night, and to-day the only answer that had been given was, that last night there was an agreement that the religious question should not be discussed. Now, if there was such an agreement—and he did not know that there was—it was that no fresh religious question should be discussed. This religious question was imported into the Bill by the clause that had been passed, and especially by the manner in which it had been passed, and the strong form it had assumed. He could understand the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council (Viscount Sandon) not wishing to have the question discussed, but that did not absolve him from giving an answer to the hon. Member for Reading.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER would not undertake to say that there was any agreement on the previous night that the religious question should not be discussed, but there was a division which indicated the sense of the Committee upon the subject. The position of the Government was this—if the proposed clause were accepted, it would be enlarging the scope of the Bill. They would be bound to consider whether the clause did not impose arbitrary conditions on managers. In fact, they would have to re-open the whole question. By so doing they would let in a variety of topics that could not possibly be considered.

Mr. J. K. CROSS, in supporting the clause, said they might ask who would be masters of the voluntary schools when those schools ceased to be voluntary and became denominational? The whole system of teaching and instruction would be altered, and while work might be increased school fees would be diminished. There was no doubt that public money would be applied for denominational teaching; but in his opinion the educational instruction, judging of the past, was very defective. Questioning the children categorically, their answers were very unsatisfactory.

Mr. WHALLEY, who spoke amid considerable interruption, said in moving to report Progress, that he did so out of deference to the impatience—he might say the legitimate impatience—of the Committee. He begged to offer as a reason for the Motion that the Amendment appeared to raise an entirely new question upon which it would be well that the Committee should have time to consider. It was that there should be some reasonable publicity given to the manner in which under this Bill public money was to be expended. ["No, no!"] If he was wrong, the observations which he made might, perhaps, be useful in reference to some other Amendment. The Government by the Bill were placing the clergy of the Church of England in an entirely new position before the law and the country. The clergy, in former times, kept the country as "a preserve" for their own benefit, but they did not instruct the children; beyond impressing them to do no harm. They were not allowed to think. He was glad to see the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had taken his seat, because the observations he was making were worthy of his attention. Under what circumstances, he asked, were the clergy to be invested with the new authority proposed by this Bill? Under no justifiable authority that he knew. Under what circumstances were they now to be placed in a position to receive and be supported by local rates? Why, the clergy now did not really know their own opinions, and they did not even know each other's opinion. [*Cries of* "Divide, divide!"]

The Chancellor of the Exchequer

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL rose to Order, and said the Question the hon. Member was speaking upon had nothing to do with the clause under the consideration of the Committee. Surely the remarks of the hon. Gentleman were equally applicable to the case of "the unfortunate nobleman at present languishing in Dartmoor prison" as to the clause under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member for Peterborough was not addressing himself to the clause at all, but justifying his Motion to report Progress; and it would be as well if he would confine himself to the Motion, for many of his remarks appeared to be wholly irrelevant.

Mr. WHALLEY thanked the hon. Gentleman for his correction. The clergy of the Church of England—— ["Divide, divide!"]

Mr. E. J. REED rose to Order. He was always anxious that the hon. Member should obtain a hearing in the House; but the time of hon. Members ought not to be wasted in this way by their having to listen to remarks having nothing to do with the subject-matter before the House.

The CHAIRMAN said, he must again call upon the hon. Member for Peterborough to address himself directly to the question before the Committee.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he considered that new questions had been started by the raising of the discussion. He would not, however, trespass longer on the Committee, and would submit his Motion that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Whalley.*)

Mr. DISRAELI said, there was an anxious desire on both sides of the House to conclude the Bill that day if possible, so that they might approach other important questions, and also take a survey of their general position, and make such arrangements which he hoped would meet with the approbation of the House. He had hoped, therefore, that such a Motion as that proposed by the hon. Member for Peterborough would not have been proposed. He need not point out to the House how unreasonable it was, and he trusted to the good sense and spirit on both sides of the House to support the Government in carrying on the business of the country.

MR. W. E. FORSTER also appealed to the hon. Member for Peterborough not to put the House to the useless trouble of dividing upon his Motion.

MR. WHALLEY said, he was willing to withdraw it.

MR. RAMSAY said, that the Motion had been only brought forward in consequence of the impatience shown by hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House. If it was withdrawn he hoped that the interruptions which caused it would not be renewed.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MR. MUNDELLA believed that if the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had been in the House when the hon. Member for Peterborough was subject to such interruptions, he would have excused the Motion which had been made, for he believed there was no one who wished more than the right hon. Gentleman that every hon. Member should have a fair hearing. With reference to the question before the House, he feared they were going to stir up a real religious difficulty, which would lead to agitation of the worst kind. He was afraid that by the adoption of the last two clauses the Government had given life and vigour to the Birmingham agitation. Why should there be an exception in favour of schools that could earn their own endowments? The money here was given open-handed, and Parliament was not to be informed what was to be done with it. The result would be that in many cases it would turn out that the money went to pay the choir, or was applied to purposes which ought to be effected by voluntary aid. He protested against granting money for which no account was rendered. If a school were State-supported it ought to be under State management and control. He feared they would be landed in a religious difficulty, respecting which every hon. Member, whether on the one side or the other of the House, would be called on by his constituents to give an account. He should like a Return which would show the total expenditure of every school in the country.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 111; Noes 185: Majority 74.

MR. A. BROWN moved, after Clause 30, the insertion of a clause giving the same power to local authorities with regard to educational endowments as school boards now had under the 13th section of the Act of 1873, and that if a school board were subsequently formed in accordance with that Act, such educational endowment should be transferred and managed by such school board.

Clause (Local authority to have same powers as School Board with regard to educational endowments,)—(*Mr. Alexander Brown,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

VISCOUNT SANDON pointed out that the House had already pronounced its opinion upon the proposition in the division upon the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright). The Government then stated that it was a proposal they could not entertain.

MR. A. BROWN said, his clause referred to endowments only, and not to the management of schools.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 108; Noes 187: Majority 79.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE moved in page 13, after Clause 37, to insert a new clause, providing that the managers of any school in receipt of an annual grant from the Education Department should annually produce an account showing in detail the income of such school from all sources. The object of the clause was to inform the localities how the managers of schools spent the fees received from the parents of the children.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, he had carefully inquired into the matter, and he found that all the information required by the clause was supplied now to the Department as a condition of the Government Grant. The adoption of the clause would depart from the principle laid down by the Government, to which they attached great importance, that the local authorities should have nothing to do with the internal details of the schools which were under voluntary management. He could not assent to the clause. He intended further on to move an Amendment to that of the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. A. M'Arthur), which would, to a certain extent, remove some of the objections of the hon. and learned Member for Reading.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the question raised was an important one, but it would not be well to press it at that time. His hon. Friend had better renew the subject on Report, after the clause of the hon. Member for Leicester had been disposed of.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, on that assurance, begged to withdraw the clause. He could assure the noble Lord that he did not wish for the interference of the local authorities, but simply to enable the parents to see the accounts, and if any other mode of publishing the accounts could be devised, he would not adhere to his proposition.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. A. MILLS moved a new clause, providing that every school district which provided accommodation in public elementary schools for all children between the ages of 5 and 13 years inclusive, resident in such a district, should be deemed to have provided sufficient school accommodation within the meaning of the Education Act of 1870. As a Member of the London School Board, he felt they had in some instances provided too much accommodation for infants. In Germany and Switzerland the limit of school age was from 5 to 13 years of age.

Viscount SANDON said, if the question of the amount of school accommodation to be required by the Department were raised, they would at once find themselves in a great sea of difficulties. The requirements of the Department had nearly all been issued to the country by the Department on a certain basis; and to accept this clause would unsettle all the arrangements made throughout the country. He trusted, therefore, his hon. Friend would not re-open this matter.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. HEYGATE moved the insertion of a new clause, providing that any alteration of rules should be construed to refer to the same rule under the Act of 1870, for which it was substituted. Its object was to prevent the raising of the question of the creation of a school board in any district more than once in three years. He instanced the case of a parish in which there had been an agitation for the establishment of a school board once a year during the last six years, and he thought the same check should be put on frivolous and wanton contests of that character as was put on contests for the dissolution of school boards by the Amendment which had been previously adopted at the suggestion of the hon. Member for Reading.

Mr. HARDCASTLE supported the clause, and said that it would prevent the frequent agitation of educational questions.

Mr. DODSON hoped that the Government would not accept the clause.

Viscount SANDON said, that by the Bill they were creating an educational authority in every parish, and bound by law to see that the instruction of no children was neglected, and that this would diminish the temptation to indulge in wanton contests for the establishment of school boards where they were not wanted to supply schools, but only for compulsory powers to fill them, as an inexpensive existing authority would be already on the spot to do the work. The question raised by the clause was, no doubt, one of importance; but if they once entered upon it, its discussion must occupy many hours. He hoped his hon. Friend would not press the clause. If the evils of which his hon. Friend complained continued, and extended to many districts, it might perhaps be well hereafter to provide by a separate measure for the purposes contemplated by his hon. Friend.

Mr. HEYGATE said, he was so confident of the justice of the proposition that he could not consent to accede to the proposition of his noble Friend.

Clause *negatived.*

Mr. A. M'ARTHUR moved a clause to repeal the last paragraph in Clause 23 of the Elementary Education Act of 1870, and to insert in lieu thereof a clause providing that every school transferred to any school board should in all matters relating to its maintenance and management be deemed to be a school provided by the school board, and any religious instruction given to scholars attending the said school between the hours of nine in the morning and five in the afternoon on any days in which the schoolhouse was in use by the school board should be only such as the Act permitted to be given in a school which had been provided by a school board. His object was to prevent such transferred schools from continuing purely voluntary schools.

Viscount SANDON said, the Education Department had no control at present in such cases. As far as possible provision had been made to meet the hon. Member's views; but the clause brought up a large number of religious questions which could not then be discussed, and he hoped it would not be pressed.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH moved the following clause, which, both in an industrial and an educational sense, was, he thought, of very great importance:—

(Employment and education of children in factories, &c.)

"Whereas by sections fourteen and fifteen of the Workshop Regulation Act of 1867 provision is made respecting the education of children employed in workshops, and it is expedient to substitute for the said sections the provisions respecting education of the Factory Acts of 1844 and 1874, Be it therefore enacted, That sections thirty-one, thirty-eight, and thirty-nine of the Factory Act of 1844, and sections twelve and fifteen of the Factory Act of 1874, shall apply to the employment and education of all children employed in factories and workshops."

Such an alteration would, he believed, make half-time education effective.

The O'CONOR DON supported the clause.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he had no objection to accept the clause, subject to some modification on the Report.

Clause *agreed to,* and *ordered* to be *added* to the Bill.

Mr. BROGDEN moved the addition of a clause to compel the Education Department from time to time to publish a list of efficient schools, whether receiving Government grants or not, such lists to be conclusive evidence that the schools not included therein are inefficient.

Viscount SANDON hoped the hon. Member would not press his clause for the reason that it would put upon the Department an amount of work which it could not well undertake. To carry out the clause, the Department would have to inspect all private adventure schools, of which there were supposed to be some 40,000, with 120,000 scholars, in the large towns alone. An inspection of the kind would be a very delicate one to undertake, and in many cases it would destroy, by direct Government action, the livelihood of the persons who owned private adventure schools, which would lead to serious difficulties. He trusted, therefore, that the hon. Member would be content to leave the private adventure schools to the sure but slower and more indirect action of the Bill, which, as it confined certificates of school attendance to certificated efficient schools, not kept for private profit, must tell upon these schools; and, more than this, as sufficient instruction for the Standard certificates was only likely to be obtained in good schools, there would be an additional reason why the bad private adventure schools would be forsaken by the parents. The good private adventure schools would, he hoped, hold their own. He thought they would be a valuable element of variety in our school system, would tend to prevent a dry uniformity, and would be useful as competitors, and give parents a larger choice.

Mr. MUNDELLA said, the insistance upon a certificate would have the effect of extinguishing these private venture schools naturally, and in the meantime it was not desirable to prevent free trade in schools.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. DISRAELI, in moving that the Chairman report Progress, suggested that the House should meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock, in order to conclude the Committee on the Bill. If this was done, the debate on the Turkish question could be proceeded with on Monday next, on which day it would also be in his power definitively to inform the House as to what, in the view of Her Majesty's

Government, should be the course of Public Business.

MR. DODSON wished to know whether, in the event of the House sitting to-morrow, any business other than the Education Bill would be taken?

MR. DISRAELI replied that only the Education Bill would be taken.

Motion *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress.

On the Motion of Mr. DISRAELI, *resolved,* " That the House, at its rising, do adjourn till To-morrow at Twelve of the clock."

BISHOPRIC OF TRURO BILL.—[BILL 185.]

(*Mr. Assheton Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into consideration."—(*Mr. Assheton Cross*).

MR. BIGGAR rose, and was speaking upon the Bill, when—

It being ten minutes before Seven of the clock, the Debate was adjourned.

The remaining Unopposed Business having been taken, and

It being now Seven of the clock the House suspended its Sitting.

The House resumed its Sitting at Nine of the clock.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present—

HARBOURS OF REFUGE—THE NORTH EAST COAST.—RESOLUTION.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT, on rising to call attention to the deficiency of Harbour accommodation on the north east coast of England; and to move—

> "That the great loss of life and property annually occurring to our shipping on the north east coast of England shows that there is a deficiency of adequate harbour accommodation in that district; and this House urges on Her Majesty's Government the construction on that coast of a suitable Harbour of Refuge and for strategic purposes,"

apologized for bringing the question forward at so late a period of the Session, but he had sought in vain for an opportunity during the last four months, and would gladly have surrendered to the Government the present evening, which he had obtained by ballot after many trials, had the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer given a more favourable answer to the Question which he had put on the preceding evening, and which he had put purposely in order to avoid being obliged to proceed with the present Motion. But when the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the construction of such a harbour as the case required must be a matter of private enterprize, and come out of local funds and the pockets of individuals, he was constrained to go on, as he considered such a mode of treating a national question was not at all satisfactory. Nor should he be doing his duty to those brave men whose lives were daily jeopardized by the state of things existing on the North East Coast, and who had committed their case to his hands, if he did not persevere with his Motion. The Committees of the House of Commons had from time to time considered the subject of our national harbours. From one of these, in 1844, had proceeded the works at Dover, Holyhead, and Alderney, and in 1853 that very question of the unprotected condition of the East Coast had undergone ample discussion. This last Committee recommended more ample accommodation for shipping on those shores; but as the exact site for a harbour of refuge was not within their province, they advised the appointment of a Royal Commission, which was accordingly formed in 1858, and was composed of men of distinguished ability and experience in the naval and military services, the Chairman being Admiral Sir James Hope. The Commissioners sat for several months, from August, 1858, till the end of February, 1859, during which period they examined more than 400 witnesses, men of every grade in the seafaring life, and of great experience in nautical affairs, and they ultimately issued their Report on the 3rd March, 1859. In the course of that Report they urged most strongly the disadvantages to which the North East Coast of England was exposed from various causes; from the iron-bound character of the shore, being not indented with bays which might afford a shelter to shipping in tempestuous weather, but being perfectly straight for many miles from the Tees to Flamborough Head; from the existing harbours along the coast being only tidal, and therefore not accessible at low water; and from the violence of the prevalent winds which blew steadily on shore from the North East. From these considerations the Commissioners advised the construction of an ample harbour of refuge at Filey, where the Brigg presented ample natural advantages, and where the surrounding cliffs would afford every facility for its formation. The Report further adverted to the large and increasing loss of life and property occurring annually off the North East Coast. The hon. Baronet proceeded to remark upon the enormous trade and commerce in the shape of exports from the various ports in Northumberland, Yorkshire, and Lincolnshire, the annual exports from the Tyne, Tees, and Wear, amounting to £15,000,000, and the annual exports from Hull alone amounting to £38,000,000, making a total of £53,000,000, being one-fifth of the exports from the whole United Kingdom, and the shipping annually sailing from and arriving at those four ports actually exceeding those sailing from and arriving in the Thames and Mersey combined. In the Newcastle and Durham coal fields, in 1873, 90,000 men were employed, whose annual wages amounted in the aggregate to £7,000,000 sterling. Then, as regarded the Tyne, there were in that river alone in 1873, 103 ships built, with a tonnage of 64,933 tons, and 7,000 men employed in shipbuilding. In 1873, between the Tyne and Humber inclusively, there were 74,447 ships entered, with a tonnage of 16,460,000 tons. Passing from the vast commerce and trade of those regions to the sad list of casualties to ships, he might mention, in the outset, that the loss of ships from unseaworthiness was as nothing compared with the losses and wreck by tempest. The history of these casualties was to be found in *The Wreck Register*, which, as hon. Members knew, was annually presented to Parliament in June. The *Register* of 1876 had not yet been presented; he therefore cited from the one published in June, 1875. In that book he found that in 1875 there were 4,259 ships lost all over the world, with a tonnage of 911,000 tons; and this list exceeded that of 1874 by 2,068 ships. Of these 4,259, 3,380 were British ships, and 3,590 out of the whole number of 4,259, were lost "on our English coasts," which, as they knew, from the narrowness of the seas and rapidity of tide, were very greatly exposed to sudden and violent storms and tempests. Of the 3,590 ships wrecked on our own coasts, 461 were total wrecks, but only 33 of these from unseaworthiness in the vessel. They had been passing an Act to protect our sailors from unseaworthy vessels; but how equally, if not more important to provide against calamity which no skill or act of man could prevent, except by providing safe places of refuge in time of tempest! Now, he would proceed to mention a most remarkable fact—namely, that out of 3,590 vessels wrecked on our English and Scotch and Irish coasts, 1,660, or nearly one-half, came to grief on the North East Coast of England. In the year 1875, 920 lives were lost in the shipping on our coasts, the average loss of life being upwards of 800. The annual loss of valuable property on the North East Coast was considered to be £1,500,000; while in two gales only, which occurred in 1854 and 1857, 138 ships were lost, and £110,000 in valuable property. That would not be surprising when, as the Commissioners' Report stated, often 1,500 vessels were seen in Yarmouth Roads at a time, and 500 off Flamborough Head; and in a heavy gale from the North East these would have to run up northward for the Firth of Forth, or southward to Harwich or the Thames, to avoid being driven on shore. The westerly gales were most frequent on the Southern and Western Coasts of England; but, here, the casualties for 1875 were only 977 on the West Coast, and 549 on the South Coast. He held in his hand accounts of casualties from one or two of the north-eastern ports, and he found at Great Yarmouth in the 16 months from 1st January, 1874, to 30th April, 1875, there were

116 casualties to shipping, involving the total wreck of 22 ships, and 39 persons drowned or killed; while at Lowestoft, where, as at Great Yarmouth, the piers and harbour had been considerably improved, but the accommodation was at both places still very defective, the casualties amounted to 165. These facts plainly demonstrated the great difficulties our brave sailors, unsurpassed in hardihood and seamanship by any in the world, had to contend with; and that the words of Sir John Coode, one of our most eminent marine engineers, at the lecture he lately gave at the United Service Institution, were most fully justified when he said that "the great want on our shores at the present day was an adequate harbour of refuge on our North East Coast." In this opinion he had been supported by Admiral Sir William Hall—who had written an able pamphlet on our national defences—Admiral Collinson, and other distinguished naval officers, who also gave it as their opinion that such a harbour was most needed also for strategic purposes. The hon. Baronet then read an extract from an essay by the late Dr. Wynter, published in *The Quarterly Review* in 1858, in which he urged that—

> "the appalling loss of life and property occurring every year on the North East Coast demonstrates the absolute necessity which exists for establishing on that most exposed and frequented position of our coast such a shelter as the sailor has a right to expect in time of need."

So far as to the commercial aspect of the question, on which he had dwelt so fully that no time remained for its strategic consideration—which he must very slightly touch upon, having already trespassed so long on the attention of the House. But it should be remembered that at the present time we had actually no place from the Tyne to the Thames where an iron-clad, if disabled or requiring to coal or water, could go in. The German Navy had very greatly increased lately, and the Government of that great Empire had, ever since 1858, been constructing, at vast expense, a noble harbour, most strongly fortified, at Wilhelmshafen, in the Bay of Yayde, at the mouth of the river Weser, where their iron-clad fleet could lie safely, and go in to refit without fear of being attacked. In 1870 the French fleet lay outside, and could not touch the fleet within. Up to 1869 the Germans had spent £1,500,000 on Wilhelmshafen, which was necessary to them, as it might happen that if shut up in the Baltic in time of war, or during the winter season, their other harbours of Kiel and Dantzic might be of little use to them. Would England begrudge spending money—a rich country like our own—to defend our commerce, and form a basis of defensive and offensive operations for our fleets, when they found Germany, Russia, and other countries making such great and rapid advances in maritime power and resources? Why, look at Cherbourg, where an enormous French fleet could ride at anchor in perfect security, and the piers and batteries had been constructed at a cheerful cost of between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000! while, on the other hand, we were building magnificent ships, and when they were built we found there was no place to receive them. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had, he must say, astonished him by an argument used last year when a discussion took place relative to a harbour at Lundy Island. The right hon. Gentleman objected to harbours being constructed by Government, because, he said, they would not pay. Such an argument was, he must say, hardly worthy of the abilities of his right hon. Friend. Did Portland pay? did Holyhead pay? did Plymouth pay? Certainly not as a 3 per cent investment; but they paid most profitably in the preservation of the lives of our gallant sailors, in the protection of our property and fleets, and in the increased prosperity and security of our common country. In conclusion, he urged strongly upon Her Majesty's Government the prompt and serious consideration of this most important question. Local ports and harbours could be established or improved by private enterprize, but such a harbour as the North East Coast required could only be made at the national expense. For no purpose could the national purse be better resorted to, or our own money be better used, than in the strengthening of our national defences, and in the lessening of those numerous dangers to which the trade and commerce, on which our superiority as a nation so materially depended, was now most unnecessarily exposed.

GENERAL SIR **GEORGE BALFOUR**, who had given Notice of an Amendment to the effect that it was expedient that there should be further inquiry as to the best mode of practically and successfully carrying out the various harbour projects, said: I very readily rise to second the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for South Warwickshire (Sir Eardley Wilmot), not because I concur in the essential part of the Motion, which urges the Government to incur at once a large outlay for a new harbour on the Yorkshire coast, but because I wish to have a debate on the important subject of how to be able to construct with success the many much needed coast harbours; for, agreeing as I most fully do with the hon. Baronet in respect to the great deficiency of harbours, I cannot think that we ought to supply that want by urging the Government to enter into new constructions of harbours in our present state of distrust as to the works being successful. As a mere money question the construction of harbours is advisable; for the annual loss of wealth to the nation by shipwrecks, is, if capitalized, fully equal to a capital of from £30,000,000 to £50,000,000. Then, again, as to the way to prevent the many losses of lives now occurring on our coasts, we do not regard the spending of money on land for sanitary improvements, for better dwellings, for good water, for providing purer air, or for a variety of purposes conducive to the saving of lives and prolonging of life amongst our people living in towns on land, but we disregard our poorer but hardy sailors and fishermen on the seas, and allow many to be annually lost by reason of the want of proper and sufficient harbour accommodation. Then, again, look at the question in the light of commercial gain. The extension and improvement of our harbours would enlarge and extend our commerce, thereby greatly increasing our ships and multiplying our seamen. Then as regards our fisheries, we have only to provide ports to which our fishing boats can find safety from the storms along the coast to insure a great increase to our fishing vessels, and consequently to the hardy and persevering fishermen, who are so willing to toil for large additions to our food, if they can only be supplied with refuge from the gales which at present destroy so many of these industrious men. We are all thoroughly alive to the importance of multiplying our commercial and war vessels, and the numbers of sailors on board, but few are alive to the wealth which the sea would yield if we multiplied our fishing vessels and fishermen. I do not specially advocate the openings for profit afforded by the seas that wash the rugged coasts of the county which I represent, because I desire to see all our coasts fairly considered by the Government; for though I know that the coast of my county has hitherto not been so treated—in so far that other parts of Scotland in counties favoured by the Scotch Fishery Board have had money spent on their harbours, whilst Kincardineshire has been neglected—yet I desire now, in mentioning the neglect, to use this as a plea for asking the Government to act in future in a fair and impartial spirit to all parts of the United Kingdom. I can confidently urge that within 30 miles of the coast of my county there is a bank on which fine fish in enormous quantities can be caught, and would be obtained if our fishing boats could run to a port in the county by the sea shore, after being exposed to the storm for a few hours. I fully believe that the wealth that could be gained by fishing that bank would more than equal the value of the produce from all the lands of the county. That this is not without some considerable support may be shown by the remarkable success of the fishings at Frazerburgh. There the fishings are said to equal the rental of that part of the county in which this new harbour is situated, and that the value of land in the neighbourhood has largely increased, to the great gain of the proprietors. I have often heard, even in this House, that the formation and improvement of harbours is a duty that ought to be undertaken by private individuals, or corporate bodies, for their own gain or advantage. I am quite willing to assent to that view, provided those parties knew how to carry on these harbour works, with some better prospect of deriving their gains than they now have. But Government has already proved, by their great failures in their attempts at harbour construction, that it is not wise for individuals to follow the Government example and fail as disastrously with as great losses of capital. The discouragement caused by the Government's failures at Alderney, at Jersey, at Ramsgate, nay, even at Dover, at Wick, at Anstruther, at Port Patrick, at Dunbar, and in several fishing ports on the coast of Scotland and Ireland, and in other places, must first be removed before private enterprize can be expected to face the risk of loss which has been there seen. It is useless and idle to repeat a truism, that private capital can and ought to be employed on such works; and so it will, and in an abundance that would astonish Europe, provided the private capitalists had as fair a certainty of not suffering the total losses of invested money as has the Government. The sole object of the Amendment of which I have given Notice, but which I am prevented by the Forms of the House from moving, is to induce Government to enter upon an inquiry as to how harbour works can be carried on without the certainty of the great failures which have so frequently happened in the undertakings of Government. I ask the Government to undo the mischief which these blunders have caused. I ask the Government to enter upon a great inquiry of national importance. We find no hesitation in employing Commissioners, not only in the United Kingdom, but abroad, in order to investigate into many subjects of far less importance than harbours. We find Commissioners of every kind employed at the public cost to find out how the people of this country can be benefited by improvements of every and many varied kinds of ordinary affairs of life—Royal Commissions at the public expense, on water, gas, coals, food, art, education, science, and innumerable other affairs, and though thousands of minds are engaged in these inquiries, yet we never hear of the story told in this House and outside the House that the subject of harbours is entirely one for private enterprize, without any such aid from Government as is so readily extended to every other branch of knowledge bearing on the ordinary concerns of the people. I could enlarge on this my favourite question of harbours, for I have tried to obtain some knowledge of the subject, and have advanced sufficiently far in my inquiries in being able to say that I know and appreciate the necessity of much more knowledge than we at present possess. I urge the Government to supply this great want, not alone by investigating into the causes of the many failures, with but few successes at home, but by having the harbours abroad examined, and the successful and unsuccessful works ascertained, with all the causes of either failure or for good results. We have much to learn along the coasts of the Mediterranean; we there find many harbours of peculiar forms, adapted to the positions on the extensive coast of that inland sea. We there find the science of using materials which has descended to the present races from the old people, evidently from the Carthaginians, and then we have the harbour designs of engineers of old times, which have in many instances been a great success. We have in modern times also harbour works which have been successful. I could particularly name Bona in Algeria as a place where an outer and inner harbour has been made by the French with a remarkable degree of success, and at a place in Algeria not so important as is the capital of my own county, Stonehaven. These are the inquiries which Government alone can undertake; no private individual can possibly be expected to incur the expense, or devote the time required for this work. Then, again, the means of access to foreign harbours can only be obtained by the influence and by the officers of Government; more than that, our war vessels must be employed to visit the various foreign ports and examine with impartiality their maritime fitness. Even now there is a great harbour in the course of construction on the coast of Holland, known as the North Sea Harbour, with a great canal successfully completed leading to the wealthy city of Amsterdam; it faces our shores, and should a powerful nation obtain the use of that harbour, it would afford refuge for vessels of large size. Few there are in this country who know of its formation; but though a commercial harbour for Amsterdam, yet its importance can be judged of when it is known that the canal which connects Amsterdam with the coast is already formed; and its vastness may be judged of by knowing that it has 27 feet of water. The success of this harbour is therefore of material importance, not only in respect to the great increase of national power it will give to Holland and Germany, but as a specimen of a work commenced on a shore exposed to gales and to seas of as much severity as fall on our own coasts. As I have promised the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. Jenkins) to afford him an opening for bringing on his important Motion, I feel that my time is come for ceasing my suggestions. I urge the Government to weigh them fairly and considerately; they are given, not to support any particular project, but for the sake of many projects for many harbours along our extensive and exposed coasts. The success in forming harbours which I anticipate from the inquiries which I advise being made will not only add to our commercial greatness, but will give a strength and a power to the defensive means of the nation. The shipping of the country will be increased, and our seamen and fishermen largely multiplied, and, above all, by new harbours being constructed, we shall save property, and the lives of our people; these are two inducements of such importance as cannot fail to commend the subject to the economist and philanthrophist.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the great loss of life and property annually occurring to our shipping on the north east coast of England shows that there is a deficiency of adequate Harbour accommodation in that district; and this House urges on Her Majesty's Government the construction on that coast of a suitable Harbour of Refuge and for strategic purposes,"—(*Sir Eardley Wilmot,*)

—instead thereof.

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY said, they were all agreed that they ought to do everything they could to reduce loss of life at sea; but the question was, whether the Motion proposed by the hon. Baronet the Member for South Warwickshire (Sir Eardley Wilmot), and seconded and opposed at the same time by the hon. and gallant Member for Kincardineshire (Sir George Balfour) was the right mode of meeting the difficulty, or whether the method on which the Government and the country had for many years made up their minds was not the preferable one. The question had been mooted for 20 years past, sometimes before Committees, sometimes by private Members, and propositions had been made sometimes for establishing harbours of refuge here and there, and sometimes for providing them all round our coasts. Every kind of proposition on the question had been taken up in that House, and even the same hon. Members had made contradictory propositions regarding it from year to year. Last year, the hon. Baronet (Sir Eardley Wilmot) had been as urgent in urging priority of claim for a harbour of refuge at Lundy Island as he now was for one in exactly the opposite direction. The hon. and gallant Member for Kincardineshire (Sir George Balfour), on the other hand, wanted them to consider how they should carry out all the various harbour projects, whether for commerce, fisheries, refuge, or offensive and defensive purposes. He (Sir Charles Adderley) would not argue which was the right way of proceeding in relation to harbours, but he thought he could show that Parliament, representing the country, had long since made up its mind how to act. Hon. Members constantly referred back to the Report of 1859, but they seemed to forget that after the presentation of that Report, Lord Palmerston induced Parliament to take action on that Report and to pass the Harbours Loan Commission Act, which gave facilities to localities throughout the Kingdom to make or improve their own harbours by the aid of Government loans on easy terms. That plan had now been acted on for many years, and he thought they had established the principle that the way to make harbours adequate to the wants of the shipping of the country was not for Government to take upon itself to construct them, but aid those who knew most about what was necessary, and had the most interest in maintaining their harbours when constructed. All experience was in favour of acting upon the principle so laid down by Parliament 25 years ago. The moment it was found that Parliament intended to act upon it the people set to work and constructed for themselves, with the offered loans, works which equalled in magnitude and rapidity of construction any works that had been done in the New World, and exceeded them in solidity. The trade left to its own judgment, instead of multiplying mere harbours of refuge, took to improving their ships, and the result had been that the old rotten sailing colliers had been replaced by steam colliers, and the number of wrecks had been correspondingly reduced. He trusted that the House would not assent to either of the Motions on the subject before it, which would be no benefit, but rather injurious to the mercantile interests, while they were antagonistic to the spirit of the country. He, however, admitted that, although Her Majesty's Government should not undertake the construction of harbours themselves, they should continue to give every facility by loans to those who were desirous of making harbours for themselves. It was always suspicious when proposals were made for public money to be granted for local purposes. There was something *primâ facie* objectionable in Government being asked to spend Imperial money for local purposes. If the localities immediately concerned did not care to execute those works themselves, surely it was not for Parliament to tax everybody else for them. Moreover, if those interested in the establishment of those harbours were to construct them for themselves, the work would be far better done than if performed by the Government, and there would be a fair probability that the harbours, when constructed, would be properly maintained. Commerce would know best where commercial harbours were wanted, and how they should be made; and, where there was no commerce, there would be no persons interested in maintaining harbours. Several national harbours had been constructed by the Government, but some of them even had not been maintained since, and he need only point to the case of Alderney harbour as a lamentable instance of the way in which public money had been thrown away in the attempt on the part of the Government to construct harbours. In the case of Holyhead, owing to a change of plans during the construction of the works, a concave surface had been exposed to the sea; and in the case of Alderney, the decision had been come to, to let the sea wash away the remaining wreck of works that had cost £1,500,000 to construct. While fully admitting the necessity for the Government to construct naval harbours for national purposes, he could not call upon Parliament to provide money, except by way of loan, for any other harbours, and he believed that the best security for life and property would be to leave it to the commercial classes to provide, improve, and maintain at the seats of commerce, our mercantile harbours. If the Government were to undertake the construction of harbours for commerce, fisheries, and refuge, two questions would arise, the first where they should begin, and the second where they should end. On the whole, he must oppose both the Motions which had been brought forward.

MR. J. COWEN said, he knew the House was anxious to engage in discussion on an important colonial question, and he would not stand between them and that debate more than a few minutes. As, however, he represented a constituency which was as deeply, perhaps more deeply, interested in this question than any other, he might be permitted to express his obligation to the hon. Baronet the Member for South Warwickshire (Sir Eardley Wilmot) for having brought the subject before the House. The Royal Commission which sat in 1859, if he recollected rightly—he spoke entirely from memory—recommended that the Government should give a certain amount of money for the purpose of forming national harbours of refuge at given points round the coast. They also recommended that assistance should be given to different localities for the formation of commercial harbours. This assistance was to be regulated according to the commercial importance of the places, and the amount of money the localities chose to invest in improving their harbours. To some places the Commission recommended that Government should supplement the local expenditure by a grant of one-third, and to others of one-fourth the amount of money spent by the local harbour authorities. The only persons in this country that had complied with the conditions laid down by the Commission for securing Government help were the River Tyne Commissioners. They had expended a large sum of money in improving the estuary of the Tyne and the navigable channel for a considerable distance. The water on the bar was now three times the depth it formerly was, and the consequence was that the Tyne now was really a harbour of refuge—the only one on that part of the North East Coast. The Government, however, had not carried out the recommendation of the Royal Commission in this respect, because they had given the Tyne Commissioners no monetary assistance. They had even not been as generous with them as he thought they might have been, by lending them funds at a moderate rate of interest. By the Act of Parliament referred to by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, the Public Works Loan Commissioners were empowered, with the sanction of the Government, to lend money to harbours on moderate terms. The help the Tyne Commissioners had got from Parliament had been comparatively insignificant. One other remark he wished to make was this—the circumstances of the North East Coast were entirely altered since 1859. A complete revolution had taken place, not only in the harbours of that part of the country, but also in the shipping and the size of the vessels frequenting them. It would, therefore, he thought, be unwise for Government to act strictly now upon the recommendation of the Commission that sat and reported 18 years ago. By change of circumstances and lapse of time many of the recommendations made at that time would not only be injudicious, but positively injurious. He thought, however, the Government might consent to the suggestion of the hon. and gallant Member for Kincardineshire (Sir George Balfour), and agree to the appointment of a Select Committee to supplement the labours of the Royal Commission, and put Parliament and the country in possession of the latest information respecting this important national question. While he supported that suggestion, he could not help expressing concurrence with the views of the President of the Board of Trade, who naturally shrank from investing any large sum of the Imperial Revenue in national harbours of refuge, with the ill success which had heretofore attended experiments of that kind before him. But more liberal help to commence harbours of refuge, where the localities had expended considerable sums of their own money, by loans, on easy terms, was what he thought the Government might wisely do.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

BARBADOES—SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITION.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. E. JENKINS, on rising to call attention to the social and political condition of Barbadoes, with special reference to the recent disturbances in the island, said, he should, but for the fact that he was precluded by the Forms of the House, have moved for an Address to the Crown praying for an inquiry into the working of the Constitution of Barbadoes, the operation of the laws, especially relating to taxation, education, vagrancy, and the proximate or remote causes of the recent disturbances. He had been induced to submit the Motion to the House in consequence of the grave questions that had lately arisen between Governor Hennessy and the oligarchy of the island—using the word oligarchy in no offensive sense, and he desired to approach the question in a judicial spirit. He hoped that other hon. Members would follow his example, neither committing themselves wholly to the Governor nor to the oligarchy which governed the community. In 1870 he had visited Barbadoes and seen the prosperity which existed there. Out of 107,000 acres 90,000 were under sugar cultivation, and were cultivated in a manner that was perhaps superior to what could be found in any other part of the world. This was due to the population exceeding 1,000 to the square mile, and hand labour was consequently brought to bear upon the land. In that island very grave questions had recently arisen. On the one hand there were the interests of a population of nearly 180,000 to be considered; and whatever their ideas and prejudices might be with regard to Governor Hennessy they ought to discuss the subject in a generous spirit towards a young man who had been placed in a difficult position. On the other side there was an oligarchy that had existed for 200 years, which presented claims for sympathy which naturally arose from their having successfully carried on a government for so many years. Whatever might be thought of the rights and wrongs of both sides, in the Papers that had been presented on the subject, Governor Hennessy had put his case in a clear, dignified, and comprehensive manner, whilst the planters had stated theirs in a heated, incoherent, passionate, and irritating manner, calculated to create a prejudice against them. Two questions presented themselves for consideration—first, with regard to the social and political constitution and circumstances of the island; and secondly, as to the Imperial question of confederation, which, no doubt, contributed, directly or indirectly, to the recent disturbances. In the Correspondence the two were so inextricably mixed up that it was difficult to estimate exactly the influence exerted by one or the other, but the one re-acted on the other. It would not be necessary to discuss the merits or demerits of the question of confederation further than to say the Governor had been anxious to carry out reforms which both himself and the Colonial Office deemed to be necessary, and for which there was undoubtedly much need. The population of Barbadoes was 180,000, with only 1,279 electors out of 30,000 adult persons. The franchise consisted of £20 freeholders and upwards; leaseholders of £200 value, and a rental of £32 10*s.* per annum of our currency. One firm alone held mortgages over half of the estates of the island, which were said to exceed £1,000,000 sterling, and the land might be said to be in the hands of what in America would be called a "plantocracy." No doubt the island had—as it had been stated—"a glorious and a liberal charter," at a time when the Whites only were acknowledged before the law to have rights, and when they held in subjection a large number of slaves. There were now 46,000 agricultural labourers in the island, 30,000 of whom were employed in producing sugar, leaving a large excess of unproductive labour in the island. Out of the 180,000 persons only 18,000 were sufficiently well off not to mind very much what taxation was imposed on food, leaving 162,000 to whom it was a matter of serious consequence. The natural result had been a great reduction in wages, whilst on the other hand the price of sugar in the world's market had been so low as scarcely to leave a profit, however large the yield might be. The consequence had been to bring down wages in the labour market, and produce vagrancy and crime. In 1872 the gaols of the island were overcrowded, and out of 256 boys then in prison only 28 had received any sort of instruction. With such intense and helpless poverty incendiarism was a natural result of the want that existed. In 1873 there were 68 fires; in 1874, 16; and in 1875, 141; and Governor Hennessy mentioned the case of one boy who had been sentenced to fourteen years' imprisonment for setting fire to a sugar field, whose previous conduct had been so bad that he found himself unable to do anything to limit the term of incarceration. He also found in prison boys seven years old who had been convicted and sentenced for the crime of incendiarism. What was complained of was not only the low rate of wages but the injustice done by managers in the stoppage of wages. An appalling amount of squalid misery existed, and concubinage became the rule, as the people could not afford to buy the clothes in which to get married. As a consequence, infanticide prevailed to the extent of 1,000 children every year. Owing to the carelessness of the Legislature the prison accommodation was insufficient, and the reports especting the lunatic asylums were simply horrible. Education was imperfectly provided for; taxation was unfair in its incidence, the general fund, for instance, being charged with a subvention for the highways which ought to be kept in repair by the planters. The persons who were most interested in improving the condition of affairs had no representation in the Government, and no means of bringing influence to bear upon it. It could not be surprising, then, that in 1863 riots took place and the troops were called out, that the same thing occurred in 1872, and that in 1875 there was plundering and rioting, a proclamation had to be issued by the Governor, the provision grounds were attacked, and a watchman was shot. In 1868 Governor Rawson was sent out to carry into effect a policy of confederation. He left the island, however, before he had been able to do so, and Governor Freeling succeeded him as Acting Governor for a few months before the arrival of Mr. Pope Hennessy. The planters and estate agents exhibited great disquietude at the prospect of confederation. That policy had been carried into effect in the Leeward Islands, and there was a strong feeling in Barbadoes that it had been effected by official influence, and had not been fairly carried. In July, 1875, there were disputes between Governor Freeling and the Assembly, and altogether there had been a good deal of agitation antecedent to the arrival of Mr. Pope Hennessy, and any one coming from the Colonial Office was looked upon with suspicion. About October, 1875, Mr. Hennessy arrived in the island as Governor, finding it, as described, in a state of excitement. From the reputation he had acquired in similar positions, and which had preceded him, he was popular with all classes, and met with a very warm reception. Within the next two or three weeks, as would be seen by the Papers, some things were done by the new Governor which could not, perhaps, be altogether approved of; but whatever occurred during the first two or three weeks ought not to be too harshly charged against him. For instance, he complimented the House of Assembly in terms which he was afterwards obliged to retract. On the 7th of December he brought the question of confederation before the Legislative Council, and at his suggestion it was arranged that a conference should take place between Representatives of the Assemblies of all the islands on the subject of confederation. It was at that time that Lord Carnarvon sent him his celebrated telegram cautioning him not to proceed too fast, and to pay great respect to the feeling and constitution of the country. A message was sent to the Assembly on the 22nd of January, and they passed resolutions in which they declared that they could not consent to become one of a confederation, but that they were willing to consider the suggestions which had been offered by the Governor. There was one thing which excited considerable feeling, and for which the Colonial Office, and not the Governor, was responsible. He was directed in the Letters Patent to divest the Legislative Council of its executive functions, and to create an executive body which should be responsible directly to the Governor. This change he (Mr. Jenkins) admitted was necessary, but it had a serious effect on the minds of the oligarchy. It was also evident that at this time the planters, or some persons connected with the planters, endeavoured to frighten the negroes against confederation by stories which were untrue—for instance, that it would lead to the re-introduction of slavery. The Defence Association was formed, and shortly afterwards the Governor went down to the Assembly and made the speech which had since become famous. However injudicious that speech was — a speech directly contradicted by a subsequent proclamation—England must feel that Governor Hennessy meant simply that confederation would open a larger field of labour—a view which had been stated by Governors before him. The result of this was a "flare up," which exhibited itself in the form of speeches and articles in the newspapers, so incoherent that one scarcely knew what to make of them. Meetings were held by the Defence Association in various parts of the island, and at length the firing from a pistol and the wounding of a person for the purpose of intimidating an excited mob, led to the outbreak of a riot, which continued until it was found necessary to call out the troops, and telegraph to neighbouring islands for further assistance. The origin of the riots undoubtedly was the excitement created by these confederation meetings held in the various parishes working on the minds of the people, aided by the fact that there were large numbers of persons in the island who were vagrants, and were ready to take advantage of any row to plunder the well-to-do people. It was a singular circumstance that not a single person was killed by the rioters, notwithstanding that there were some of the rioters killed, 30 or 40 wounded, and a large number taken prisoners, and this circumstance was, he thought, an indication that there had been a certain amount of panic among the planters, and that it was the re-action from that panic which had caused the deaths which had occurred. There would, he felt sure, have been absolute cruelty inflicted but for the coolheadedness of Governor Hennessy, who undoubtedly had persistently set his face against the various representations which had been made to him in that direction. For instance, he had been urged by a lieutenant colonel in Her Majesty's Service to take to flogging. In another letter, he was advised that hanging would be a good thing; and in a third, he was recommended to train a gun down the streets of Bridgetown. Whatever, then, might be thought of his conduct in the earlier stages of these proceedings, he had subsequently, at all events, shown a decision of character which was worthy of the favourable recognition of the House. He would further point out that when the rioting had subsided, the Legislature absolutely proposed to discuss the question of the Governor's recall. This step was proposed in the midst of the excitement following the riots, and it was only by using a very strong influence that Mr. Hennessy was able to stop that dangerous proposal. The Governor declared that the animosity exhibited against him was so great that again and again the slanders which had been uttered with regard to him were repeated, and he also stated that the state of things was such that he dared not dissolve the Assembly and issue writs, as he knew it would lead to a renewal of rioting. Whatever they thought of Mr. Hennessy's conduct, they must do him the justice to well weigh the fact that he had been acting in a time of great excitement. One thing was clear—namely, that things in Barbadoes could not be allowed to remain as they were, and he put a case before the House for inquiry. They had not sufficient evidence before them to enable them to form a judgment on the matter. He neither fully exonerated the Government nor censured the planters, but they must have a full inquiry, for grave charges had been made against the Governor, and there were many matters to be investigated, which could only be brought out by a Commission appointed by the Government. Whatever the result, one thing was certain—namely, that the present Constitution of Barbadoes was doomed. A Constitution which might be suitable in a time of slavery could not exist with anything like proper and just government at the present time. Therefore, if he had been able to move his Resolution, he should have not asked for inquiry merely upon the ground that justice might be done between a Governor and a community with which he was at variance, but upon the ground also that it was absolutely necessary to consider whether it was desirable that the existing Constitution of Barbadoes should be continued. Although the House could not come to any Resolution on the subject, he thought Her Majesty's Government would agree with him that an inquiry into the condition of the Island was absolutely necessary; and he trusted they might look forward to the time when reforms would be introduced into Barbadoes, the result of which would be that the island would be not only outwardly prosperous and flourishing, but the abode of a free, happy, and contented population.

Mr. THORNHILL said, he must at once emphatically contradict the assertions of the hon. Member for Dundee, that the condition of Barbadoes was anything like what the hon. Member had described. He (Mr. Thornhill) had received a letter from a clergyman on the island stating exactly the contrary. He maintained that the planters were fully sensible of their responsibility in respect to the education, peace, and happiness of the negro population. There was no doubt a redundant population in Barbadoes, and that created misery and distress, and he should like to see a well-devised system of emigration brought into play to put an end to such a state of things. With reference to the telegrams which passed between the Earl of Carnarvon and Governor Hennessy there could be no doubt the Governor had considerably falsified facts, and that they contained gratuitous pieces of incorrect information. The truth, it would appear, had to be forced out of him, and, if it had not been for the private telegrams received from the island, and which led to the Home Government taking action, the country would never have found out the true state of the case. The question now arose, could the people of Barbadoes get on with a Governor who was not on good terms with the better classes of the population? He had excited an excitable people, and he had not acted in that reasonable and careful manner which they might have expected from him. He (Mr. Thornhill) thought they could not, and he therefore hoped another Governor would be substituted for him.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, it was only necessary to have listened to the two speeches delivered to find out that there were two sides to this question. It would be his good fortune to agree with a certain amount of what had fallen from both hon. Gentlemen; but he would also have to express considerable difference from both. The hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. Jenkins) had recounted various historical circumstances connected with the island of Barbadoes, which it would not be necessary to touch upon seriatim. He would take up the hon. Gentleman at his last point—namely, the disturbances that broke out in the spring of the year. The first thing to be noticed in connection with these disturbances was the various charges which were bandied about between the Governor, the Assembly, and the Planters' Defence Association. He would first deal with the charges brought against the Governor, a great many of which might be described as paltry, but there were others which, if proved, would have called for serious notice. For instance, it was alleged that Mr. Hennessy entertained at his official residence persons of the Negro race who were not exactly the proper subjects of a Governor's hospitality. Of course, the House would see that it was impossible for the Colonial Office to lay down regulations as to the mode in which a Governor's hospitality ought to be exercised; but he felt bound to say that if the charges made on this point had been true there would have been occasion for some surprise, if not alarm, in the island. However, he was happy to be able to state that Mr. Hennessy denied those charges. Another allegation was that Mr. Hennessy had deliberately falsified the telegrams he despatched to the Home Government, underrating and occasionally suppressing facts. Mr. Hennessy's accounts, no doubt, differed from those of the West Indian Committee, but striking a fair balance, the truth would probably be found to lie somewhere between them. Mr. Hennessy might not have been informed of the full magnitude of the events which occurred, while the Committee, probably, was misled in the opposite direction. The House, he was sure, would readily give credit to both parties for a sincere desire to get at the truth. But two charges of a more serious nature were made against Mr. Hennessy—one being that he personally encouraged agitation against the Assembly of the island in favour of federation, the other that he made certain objectionable observations in a speech. He might state at once on the first point that Mr. Hennessy entirely denied that, either directly or indirectly, he was in any way responsible for the agitation which prevailed, and there appeared to be nothing in the Blue Books to justify any one in doubting his word. With regard to the second charge, relating to the speech of the 3rd of March to the Assembly, it was certainly to be regretted that Mr. Hennessy should have made use of certain phrases which, in a community like that of Barbadoes, were calculated to cause considerable uneasiness. No doubt, however, he used them without fully realizing their import, and it was unnecessary unduly to dwell on them. Passing on to the time when the disturbances unfortunately broke out, he was glad to find that the conduct of Mr. Hennessy left little to be desired. Mr. Hennessy apparently acted with promptitude and energy, and, beset though he was by conflicting counsels, maintained great coolness of judgment and presence of mind. He had the misfortune to be surrounded by not very discreet friends, some of whom had been already alluded to by his hon. Friend (Mr. Thornhill), who had more particularly referred to one gentleman (Sir Graham Briggs). Now, this gentleman was not a public servant, he was happy to say, and it was not incumbent upon him (Mr. Lowther) to attempt to explain what he must admit was most unwise conduct on his part. This mischievous agitation about Confederation, in which a legal adviser of the Government was said to be mixed up, could not be too strongly reprobated. If, however, Mr. Hennessy was unfortunate in his friends, he must be congratulated upon having such opponents as he had. The Colonial Office had received innumereble letters and telegrams from various persons connected directly or indirectly with the island, and with a few exceptions he was bound to say that the tone adopted by those who opposed Mr. Hennessy had been as indiscreet or more so than that of those friends to whom he had referred. For instance, an application was made to the Secretary of State on the strength of a private telegram, uncorroborated by any authenticated details, for the instantaneous removal of Governor Hennessy. That was an appeal to which no Secretary of State with any sense of justice could for a moment listen. He had now mentioned the charges which were made against Mr. Hennessy; he had not hesitated to indicate where he thought his conduct had not been discreet, and at the same time he had stated, and he hoped he had made it clear, that Mr. Hennessy had triumphantly acquitted himself of the more serious accusations brought against him, while, moreover, his conduct during a trying emergency had been all that could be desired. He now came to the charges which had been brought against the Assembly, the planters, and the Defence Association; and with regard to the first the Assembly of Barbadoes had been charged with systematically neglecting the interests of the population of the island. Their financial arrangements were alleged to be most defective, the prisons to be in a most deplorable condition, the police system to be very unsatisfactory, and the Assembly had been accused of omitting to make proper provision for correcting those evils. Those charges, he was afraid, had been proved against that body. He was happy, however, to be able to say that the latest information which the Government had received led them to hope that as regarded the prisons the Assembly would enter upon the necessary reform. He might observe that several suggestions had been made by Mr. Hennessy in the Assembly which that body had not felt itself able to concur in. Among them was a suggestion that it should energetically grapple with the question of emigration—a matter of serious importance in all over-crowded communities. He thought that the over-population of Barbadoes could only be met by a system of emigration to the neighbouring islands, and it was to be hoped that the Assembly would soon devote its attention to that subject. One point which Mr. Hennessy pressed upon the Assembly had reference to the fact that four weeks' notice to quit was the condition under which agricultural labourers held their tenancies. Mr. Hennessy quoted a passage written by one of his predecessors strongly condemning that system—a passage which he confessed he had read with feelings that he could hardly venture to describe to the House. It suggested that the proprietors had it in their power to effect an important reform in that matter by granting leases in perpetuity to the tenants. Now, the labourers in Barbadoes for the most part inhabited houses, such as they were, of their own building, and erected on the land of their employers. He understood that at one time the proprietors on certain estates erected dwellings for their own labourers, but that that system had fallen into disuse, because that which had been intended to do duty as a roof was made to serve as fuel, and the labourers now erected dwellings for themselves on their employers' ground. But the idea of granting leases in perpetuity to labourers to dwell on an estate on which from circumstances they had ceased to labour was a most extraordinary one. It was only right to add that Mr. Hennessy, further on, said he shrank from the strong measure that his predecessor recommended of granting leases in perpetuity, which would in his judgment be an invasion of the just rights of property; but as an equitable and efficient remedy he should submit to the Legislature a proposal for abolishing the four weeks' notice to quit and substituting a much longer notice. Hon. Members would know from their own experience that the length of notice to labourers on English farms was about a week or a fortnight, and he therefore saw no reason why the length of notice in Barbadoes should be extended beyond its present limit—namely, four weeks. It was only right that the Assembly of Barbadoes should be made fully aware of the view of the Home Government upon this point. With respect to compensation being made to the tenants for what were termed unexhausted improvements which they had effected with the consent of their landlords, the Legislature might fairly enough take that into consideration, care being taken not to interfere with the sacred right of freedom of contract. But as to the idea of interfering by legislative enactment with the arrangements between employer and employed on the estates, he thought that was a notion which it would be most unwise to allow to go forth as having the approval of Her Majesty's Government, since their influence for good would be seriously diminished if they were to be suspected of any sympathy with Communism. The subject had not been overlooked, and his noble Friend the Secretary for the Colonies had lost no time in telegraphing to the Governor of Barbadoes to take no further action with reference to proposals bearing on the relations of landlord and tenant. With regard to the alleged obstructive tendency of the Assembly, he hoped that that body had learnt wisdom by recent events, and that they were now disposed to effect some necessary reforms. The hon. Member for Dundee had spoken of a re-constitution of the form of government in Barbadoes.

For himself, he (Mr. Lowther) confessed he did not follow many hon. Gentlemen who appeared to have a preference for despotic forms of government. A good deal had been said about an oligarchy. He presumed that oligarchy meant the government of the many by the few, and he confessed to having no objection on principle to that form of government. Whether the suffrage in Barbadoes was capable of extension was a question on which at present he should not like to offer an opinion; but it would be necessary to take care that by any efforts in this direction the property and intelligence of the community should not be swamped by the negro vote. Other questions had been touched upon in the course of the debate. Something had been said about federation, but he did not wish to enter into a full discussion of the question at that time. He thought it matter of regret that the Assembly had not seen their way more distinctly upon this question, though, if they thought it would affect the rate of wages, or the price of food, they had a right to protect themselves, and he could not wonder at their objecting to anything of the kind; but it had now been fully explained that federation had no such object, and he trusted that a plan which promised improvement in the present system of government would be adopted. He trusted that no spirit of intractability would be shown, and that the Legislature of the colony would of their own will take steps for the effecting of such reforms as were necessary. It would be a matter of regret to the Home Government if they were compelled to adopt a line of action opposed to the love of Constitutional principles and the aversion to interfere with established institutions to which reference had been made. Reference had also been made to the absentees. He had looked into the question as far as he had been able, and he believed that, so far from the absentees being the worst landlords in the island, to a certain extent they were the best. He would remind the House that many of these estates had been held by the same families for generations, and the system of absentee proprietorship had been connected with the institutions of the island. He happened to know one case of a Nobleman in this country, whose estates were admitted to be the best managed in the island. He believed it was also a mistake to suppose that the fact of certain properties in the island being mortgaged to persons resident in this country did any practical harm to the colony, for it was not the fact that such mortgagees were persons of usurious tendencies. He had observed with regret some reflections which had been cast, in the Correspondence on the Table, upon one particular firm which he believed to be wholly uncalled for; and with regard to the gentleman named Mr. Thomas Daniel Hill, he felt bound to say that if this irritating controversy had been conducted in all quarters in a similar spirit, matters would have now stood in a far more favourable position. As it had been his duty to speak in terms of censure of almost everybody connected with the island, he was glad to be able to mention the name of one gentleman who at any rate thoroughly deserved the thanks of the Government and the House. He meant Colonel Clarke, who deserved all praise for his conduct throughout these troubles. As far as Her Majesty's Government were concerned, he might say at once that they had no intention of appointing any Commission, as suggested by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee, to inquire locally in the island into the questions which had been brought forward. His noble Friend the Secretary of State was prepared, on behalf of the Government, to undertake the sole responsibility of dealing with the matter; and he was of opinion that the appointment of a Commission to inquire locally would probably cause a renewal of controversies which had been happily laid aside and re-open heart-burnings and recriminations that had been abandoned. Further, it had been decided after full consideration that it was not the duty of the Government to recall Governor Hennessy. To recall a Colonial Governor was, under any circumstances, a measure of a very serious character, in that it was apt to reflect discredit upon the person recalled, and to cause those who had opposed him to conclude that they were altogether in the right. On the whole, his noble Friend did not think that, under existing circumstances, it would be wise to recall the present Governor of Barbadoes. But if in the course of time a favourable opportunity for a transfer or exchange between Mr. Hennessy and the Governor of another colony should arise, of course that would be a matter which would be fully considered by his noble Friend the Secretary of State. At present, however, it was not his noble Friend's intention to take any step in the matter. Now, it had been his painful duty to distribute, perhaps rather freely, a certain amount of blame among many people in connection with this matter. He hoped he had done so with as little unfairness as possible. While he had been obliged to speak in terms of depreciation of some gentlemen who had conducted this agitation against Mr. Hennessy, he had also felt himself compelled to speak with regard to some minor matters in candid terms of the conduct of the Governor. He had, however, the satisfaction of being able to state to the House that it was the opinion of Her Majesty's Government that Mr. Hennessy had fully cleared himself of the more serious portion of the charges brought against him; and it was an especial satisfaction to him that a gentleman who had occupied a very honourable position in that House, and who had distinguished himself in Parliament, had an opportunity, of which he was confident he would avail himself, of earning distinction yet again in the Service of the Crown.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he was glad at the conclusion at which Her Majesty's Government had arrived in regard to this matter, for it was the conclusion to which he himself should have come from the evidence of the Papers on the subject—namely, that the conduct of Governor Hennessy in very difficult circumstances had been such as on the whole to deserve the confidence of the Government and the House of Commons. There had been much excitement as to his acts, and for several weeks the charges against him were constant and numerous; but they would all probably feel, with the full evidence before them, that as the hon. Member opposite (the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies) had said, those charges had dwindled down to very small dimensions. In point of fact, it was quite clear that Mr. Hennessy had shown great moderation, courage, and discretion, and that if he was in any way to blame it was for mistakes in point of management or prudence which almost any one might have fallen into. Many of us recollected what had happened in a neighbouring colony some years ago, and it was impossible to read the accounts of the excitement in Barbadoes and of the panic which had prevailed there without a feeling of gratitude to the man who had saved us from horrors which might have readily occurred. Any blame that might be attached to Mr. Hennessy was, upon investigation, diminished to a few remarks which were contained in his speech; and if he had had to make that speech over again he probably would not have used the same words. When we came carefully to read the speech which had been so much found fault with, it would, he thought, appear a very natural, though not a very prudent, one. Mr. Hennessy had gone out knowing that one of the objects of the Home Government—an object, too, with many preceding Governments—was to obtain, if possible by the goodwill of the colony itself, confederation. Mr. Hennessy was convinced, he thought rightly, that confederation would be for the advantage of the colony, and what he stated was simply this—that in all probability it would have a good result upon the whole social condition of the people. In one way, for instance, the encouragement of emigration—it might have that result. If they had to inquire further into this matter he must say there certainly was evidence in these despatches that there was an agitation in the island against the proposal for confederation, and to that agitation might fairly be traced the disturbances that followed. He could not say less with regard to Mr. Hennessy. He had always sat opposite to that Gentleman in that House, and had not always agreed with him in opinion; but he felt great pleasure in bearing his testimony that one who had been an honour to the House of Commons and to Parliament had not disgraced himself, but, he must fairly say, had distinguished himself by his conduct in this matter. As to the Constitution of the colony, he could hardly understand from the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State whether the Home Government intended to make any alteration. One alteration they had suggested with regard to the Council. To that suggestion, he believed, was very much owing the opposition with which the Governor had been received, and no doubt that was an additional reason why the Home Government should sympathize with Mr. Hennessy. He confessed he could not but agree with his hon. Friend the Member for Dundee (Mr. Jenkins) that there was great danger to good government in the present Constitution of such a colony as Barbadoes. He did not know that he should have used the word oligarchy, but he could hardly join in the criticism of the term by the Under Secretary of State. Certainly one remark which the Under Secretary made seemed to show that there must be a feeling at the Colonial Office that the Constitution as it now existed was not the best of all Governments, or he would not have given the excuse he did for their dislike to confederation. No doubt there was a redundant population in Barbadoes, and that, consequently, wages were very low; and no wonder therefore that federation was disliked by the Assembly if supposed likely to raise the rate of wages. That was an illustration of the danger and difficulty of governing a numerous colony by an assembly chiefly representing the employers. He should have been glad if the Under Secretary could have informed them of the manner in which Lord Carnarvon intended to deal with these difficulties. He had every confidence in Lord Carnarvon's colonial policy, and his great desire to be just to all parties and races under his sway, and he felt certain that, although he was not prepared to inform the House, through the Under Secretary of State, of the actual measures he was going to take, he must initiate some change in the Constitution, and not leave the island in its present position. He was glad the Government had come to the conclusion that it would be unjust and impolitic to remove Governor Hennessy.

COLONEL MURE said, he was glad that the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Carnarvon) refused the demand of the Committee from Barbadoes, that Governor Hennessy should be withdrawn; but he regretted to find that the Government did not intend to institute an inquiry through a Royal Commission. The fact that there was a party in London trying to press their views upon the subject on the Government showed that all controversy in the island had not been laid aside. Much of the evils that had recently taken place was owing to the pushing of confederation on the colony, although the noble Earl had said he did not wish it until its inception came from the Legislative Body of the island. At that moment the island was in a most unsatisfactory condition. There was a great deal of pauperism and vagrancy there, and a large proportion of the respectable population were in direct variance with the Governor, and demanding his recall. He (Colonel Mure) was opposed to his recall on the demand of any individual; but the fact of the demand having been made showed an unsatisfactory state of things. One thing was clear, that further inquiry should take place.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, he was a personal friend of Governor Hennessy, and that he had received a letter from him in which he solemnly denied that he said or did anything in any degree to sanction or encourage the disturbances that had taken place there. Governor Hennessy had been placed in a very exceptional position, and had a most delicate and difficult duty to perform. In the first place he had to promote confederation, and next to make some alteration in the constitution of the colony. He had to reconcile the oligarchy of the Whites to the Natives, who were reduced to a most miserable state of pauperism, and were greatly oppressed. Any Gentleman who had read the Blue Books must have seen that under these difficult circumstances Governor Hennessy had shown along with good intentions great prudence and discretion. It was to be hoped that Her Majesty's Government would allow him to retain his present position. A man in such a position should be supported by the Government in the honest discharge of his duty, and he was rejoiced to find from the discussion that Governor Hennessy had not done anything unworthy of his position.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK thought that some injustice had been done to the

Legislative Assembly of Barbadoes in the remarks which had fallen from some hon. Members.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, 29th July, 1876.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee — Report*—Elementary Education [155-277].
Third Reading—Savings Banks (Barrister) * [269]; Slave Trade * [270]; Cattle Disease (Ireland) * [94], and *passed.*

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

QUESTION.

MR. MURPHY said, that the Irish Cattle Show was to be held in Cork on the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th of August, at which many Irish Members wished to be present. The Lord Lieutenant had graciously promised to attend, and had accepted an invitation to a banquet on Wednesday next. He wished to know, Whether, under these circumstances, the honourable Member for Londonderry County would proceed with his Motion on the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill on Wednesday next, having regard to the short time given for consideration of the Government Amendments?

MR. R. SMYTH, in reply, said, he felt the greatest reluctance to deprive any hon. Member from meeting the Lord Lieutenant at Cork, and, so far as the hon. Member was concerned, he could pair with his Colleague, which would enable him to do so. It was his intention to ask the House on Wednesday to go into Committee on the Bill.

Sir John Lubbock

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

[BILL 155.]

(*Viscount Sandon, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress* 28*th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

VISCOUNT SANDON said, as he had promised the hon. Member for South Leicestershire to meet possible evils to which he had called his attention, he would propose a new clause, so that there might be no doubt whatever that the public money earned by the schools was expended for the purposes intended by Parliament. The clause was as follows:—

(The conditions of a Parliamentary grant to include application of incomes to purposes of public elementary schools only.)

"The conditions required to be fulfilled by schools in order to obtain annual Parliamentary grants shall provide that the income of the schools shall be applied only for the purposes of public elementary schools."

MR. W. M'ARTHUR thought the clause would meet the object in view.

Clause read a second time, and *ordered* to be added to the Bill.

MR. BOORD moved the following new clause:—

(No prosecutions to be undertaken except with the authority of at least three members of a School Board, School Attendance Committee, or Local Committee.)

"No legal proceedings for non-attendance, or irregular attendance at school, shall be commenced in a court of summary jurisdiction, by any person appointed to carry out the compulsory bye-laws of a School Board or Local Authority, except by the direction of not less than three members of a School Board, School Attendance Committee, or Local Committee, who shall have previously investigated the circumstances under which it is proposed to take such action."

The hon. Gentleman said, the object of the clause was to carry out the intention of the Act of 1870 with regard to prosecutions—that they should not be resorted to until every other means of inducing the attendance of the children had failed, and only then after very careful inquiry into the circumstances of each case by persons who, from their local knowledge, were thoroughly competent to perform the duty. In the metropolis and in large towns the need of such caution was greatest, since the circumstances of individuals were less likely to be known there than elsewhere. Hence, in some of the London districts, divisional committees of the ratepayers had been formed, who were admirably fitted for the discharge of these functions. Speaking at the opening of the new offices of the London School Board, after describing the method of persuasion to be employed by the visitors, Sir Charles Reed said of the divisional committees—

> "Afer that, it rests with the ratepayers themselves, who constitute the divisional committee, to decide whether the superintendent shall take any case before the magistrate, so that the public authority shall give decision. Therefore, I think the Board, having placed the power in the hands of the ratepayers, may fairly say that they have sought the very best tribunal. In every division of London we have ladies and gentlemen who are united in this benevolent work: they investigate at great pains every case, they see every parent, and they direct every step; and the question is carried before the magistrate, subject to the committee of the Board, at their instigation."

There was also a resolution passed by the London School Board on the 19th June, 1872, to the effect—

> "That no prosecution in any division, to enforce the bye-laws for compulsion, be carried on, except by the authority of the divisional members, or a majority of them, who shall be solely responsible to the Board therefor."

Now, the sentiment contained in that speech, and the policy laid down by that resolution, was all that could be desired; but what he complained of, was, that the practice of the Board had not been in accordance with its professions, for by a Return that had been presented to the House he learned that out of 2,154 cases that had gone before the magistrates in the Greenwich Division, with which he was naturally chiefly concerned, only four had been investigated in the manner prescribed by the resolution he had quoted, whilst, in some 50 cases, the preliminary investigation had been left to the superintendent of visitors. A resolution of this kind was an instruction to the members of the Board, and it was highly unsatisfactory to find some of them, within one month of its passing, deliberately arranging to violate it, as was shown to be the fact by the Return. Up to the 17th of March, 1875, the divisional committee of ratepayers had some voice in the matter, though not nearly so much as was represented by Sir Charles Reed in his speech; but after that they had been superseded, apparently without reason given. During the time the committee exercised their functions, prosecutions had been going on at the rate of about 500 per annum; whilst, after their dismissal, the rate increased to nearly 700—an increase of something like 40 per cent. The general result of all this had been, that a great outcry had been raised in the division, the magistrates had complained publicly of the want of care exercised in inquiring into the cases brought before them, and there was great danger of education becoming unpopular amongst those whose sympathy it was especially desirable to have, if something were not done in the way of a remedy. Now, the clause he (Mr. Boord) proposed was declaratory of the intention of the Act of 1870; it was, as he had shown, in close agreement with the declared policy of the School Board, and he therefore trusted it would meet with the approval of the Committee.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, it would be a very serious matter to embody this clause in the Bill. The proper judge in these cases was the magistrate, and nothing could check unnecessary prosecutions more than if the magistrate were to say that there were no grounds for them. Great caution on the part of the school boards he admitted to be necessary.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, it was exceedingly desirable that those cases should be investigated with great care by the school boards before the parents were subjected to inconvenience and annoyance by being summoned; and if there was an impression in the country that school boards were acting with harshness to the parents, an appeal would probably be made to Parliament on the subject. But he was unwilling to hamper the action of the school boards as well as that of the new school attendance committees, by any direction of so stringent a character as this. Public opinion, he trusted, would exercise a salutary check on the conduct of school boards in this matter, if they had not used sufficient caution and care. He hoped it would get to the school boards through the ordinary channels, that both his right hon. Friend and himself were of opinion that great caution was necessary; but he must repeat what he had said in the House on the various occasions when attacks had been made on the action of school boards in the matter of compulsion, that he believed they had generally shown a rare discretion, delicacy, and judgment in the exercise of this difficult duty which Parliament had imposed upon them.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT was sorry his noble Friend could not accept the clause. Looking at the way in which prosecutions had been conducted, not by the London School Board only, but by school boards in general, he could not think that the state of the question was altogether satisfactory. It should be remembered that the class of persons affected were those least able to protect themselves, and that all that was asked was that no prosecution should be ordered, without due consideration by at least two responsible persons. He suggested that his noble Friend might prepare a clause to meet the difficulty, and bring it up on Report.

Mr. A. M'ARTHUR said, that the London School Board, of which he had been a member, had invariably exercised the greatest care before summoning parents; and if upon investigation a clear case was not made out no further steps were taken. There were very few instances in which the magistrates had censured the school boards. The adoption of this clause would inflict injustice upon the school boards.

Mr. ONSLOW, on behalf of the poor in rural districts, urged the noble Lord to re-consider his decision, and to bring up a clause of a milder character on the Report than the one before the Committee, in order to protect parents from hardships, which were not at all unlikely to arise.

Mr. RAMSAY said, it gave him great satisfaction to hear the noble Lord refuse to accept the clause. The conclusion he had arrived at during the progress of these discussions was that, though there might be a few exceptions, the House, as a whole, was deeply anxious to secure the education of the mass of the population. But what, he asked, was likely to be the effect of a clause which threw doubt on the discretion with which school boards had exercised the powers intrusted to them? If cases which appeared hard did occur, they could only be cases where parents were neglecting the education of their children, and those were the very cases which the House had in view in framing this measure. He did hope that no such restriction would be imposed on the local authorities, but that, trusting to their discretion, the Committee would enable them to exercise without interference of any kind the compulsory powers which had already been granted. He concurred most cordially in the opinion that school boards and local authorities generally ought to deal tenderly with parents in inducing them to send their children to school. There might have been instances in which the feelings of parents had not been regarded in the spirit which the Committee would desire; but, upon the whole, the evils that could result from prosecutions to parents who neglected the education of their children were far less than those which might be apprehended from placing such a restriction as this upon the action of school authorities.

Mr. MELLOR hoped the hon. Gentleman would divide the Committee on his clause. The beadles who enforced school attendance were the most bumptious of men, and there were many cases to his own knowledge in which there was no occasion whatever for taking out a summons. In his own borough every case brought before the magistrate cost 8*s*., the greater part of which had to be borne by the rates.

Mr. HENLEY was unable to give an opinion as to whether the clause was quite sufficient to secure care in instituting prosecutions; but he thought hon. Members must all agree that it was very unfortunate when the prosecutions were instituted unnecessarily, and now it would be additionally unfortunate since persons might have to travel eight or ten miles or more to the petty sessions where the cases would be heard. There would be not only this hardship, but also the loss of a day's work. As to whether it would be desirable to have exactly the number of persons to investigate cases, he was scarcely prepared to give an opinion upon that point; but, at any rate, the investigation should be by a competent authority.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU urged that the local authorities would not allow the Inspector to bring cases unnecessarily before the magistrate, because if they did they would be cast in costs.

Mr. KNOWLES said, he hoped the noble Lord would re-consider his decision. By having a committee of two or three persons to investigate the cases beforehand the hands of the Inspector would be strengthened.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY suggested whether it would not be possible that the Education Department should issue a Minute requiring that more care should be taken than at present. Hon. Members all felt the almost indiscreet way in which in some districts these summonses had been issued, and there was nothing more likely to make school boards unpopular. It would be a very easy thing before proceedings were taken to get the signatures of two or three persons who had investigated the matter.

MR. W. E. FORSTER urged that it would be a very grave thing to produce the impression that the House of Commons thought the school boards had misused their power. It was very remarkable, considering what the difficulties were, how few unnecessary cases had been brought forward; and generally, when both sides had been heard, the school board had come well out of it. Before the Committee weighed down persons desirous of doing their duty with their disapproval there ought to be an inquiry by a Committee or Commission into the subject.

MR. RODWELL joined in the appeal which had been made to the noble Lord to see whether he could not on the Report bring up a clause which would prevent poor persons from being harassed by unnecessary prosecutions. No one could read the newspapers without seeing that cases of the greatest hardship had occurred.

MR. HARDCASTLE ~~said~~, he happened to be a member of the school board of Salford, and in that borough and in Manchester every case was investigated by members of the school board. If gentlemen undertook the duties of a school board they were bound to perform them.

MR. ROWLEY HILL said, he was a member of the school board for the town which he represented (Worcester), and that the greatest care was taken and every investigation made before parents were summoned before the magistrate.

VISCOUNT SANDON believed that the mass of school boards took every care before taking out summonses. He did not think that the hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Boord) intended to cast any slur on the school boards, but he felt sure that the clause would go much further in fact than was generally desired. He would before the Report consider the suggestion of his right hon. and learned Friend the Recorder (Mr. Russell Gurney), and see whether it would not be possible for the Department to do something in the moderate way which he had suggested to meet the wishes so largely expressed. If he could, he should be glad to do so; but he could give no positive pledge on the subject.

MR. BOORD, replying to the observations that had been made, said, he was afraid his anxiety to save the time of the Committee had led to an omission in his opening remarks. He was not amongst those who bore the school boards any ill-will, and he wished to disclaim any feeling of prejudice in bringing this matter forward. He believed the London School Board had done very good work, and would continue to do it in the future. All he wished to secure was that proper precautions should be taken to protect parents from hardship being inflicted through the indiscriminate exercise of a very stringent power. He thought he had shown that such precaution had not always been taken. In reply to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), who had said that if this clause were passed, it would be necessary to prove in each case that there had been an investigation before it could be brought before the magistrate, he said that would no doubt be so; but he had in his mind a case that had been recently tried in which the magistrate took precisely that view of the existing law, and, on it being shown that no investigation by the members had taken place, dismissed the summons with costs against the school board. He agreed with the noble Lord that it would be unfortunate if the opinion gained ground that there had been recklessness in these matters, and it was chiefly on that account that he had proposed this clause. The hon. Member for Lambeth (Mr. M'Arthur) opposite had said that it would be impossible to get three members together to do the work; but he would ask whether the due investigation of such cases was not part of the duty of a school board? The argument that it would be impossible to get three men together to perform so obviously essential a duty, was the weakest that had been produced, and, in reality, tended to show the need of the clause. In reference to the statement of the hon. Member for Worcester (Mr. Rowley Hill), he would only say that he wished the system that prevailed there was carried out universally. He was exceedingly sorry that his noble Friend had not seen his way to make any definite promise; and unless he could give an assurance that something would be done in the direction indicated by the clause, he (Mr. Boord) would feel compelled to press it to a division.

Viscount SANDON replied that he could not go a step further in regard to pledging himself in the matter than he had done, and that he thought his hon. Friend ought to have accepted the assurance already given that the question would be considered, and he would have another opportunity of bringing forward his Amendment, if he was not satisfied with his proposal, on the Report.

Mr. W. M'ARTHUR denied that he had said it was impossible to get three members together to do the duty referred to by the hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Boord); he had merely contended that in large districts like Lambeth, which covered an area of 11 square miles, and constituted one district, it would be impossible that cases occurring in all parts of that large area could be investigated by any committee.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he hoped that as the Vice President of the Council had promised to consider the subject the hon. Member for Greenwich would not press the clause at present. If the noble Lord did not do anything to meet his views, he could move the clause on the Report, substituting two for three.

Mr. WHALLEY begged to tender the thanks of the public and his own to the hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Boord) for having brought forward this point. He thought it essential that some such provision should be made, and trusted that the Government would see their way to the adoption of a clause similar to that under discussion.

Mr. BOORD withdrew the clause, stating that he would re-introduce it, with some modification, on the Report.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Schedule 1.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH moved, in page 14, line 40, to leave out "250," and insert "350." The object of the Amendment was to provide that 350 attendances between the ages of 5 and 10 should be required in order to obtain a labour pass.

Viscount SANDON pointed out that the 250 attendances were required in each of the 5 years. No reasonable excuses here came in, and considering the number of years in which the attendances must be made, and the anxiety the parent would have to secure that the child got on in his learning so as to secure the Standard pass, in case the attendances failed, he could not think there was a necessity proved for making a more stringent rule as to the Attendance pass. Illness or other circumstances might interfere with the children going to school, and the Government thought that they could not safely strain the number beyond 250.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, without urging the noble Lord to accept the Amendment, suggested that he should re-consider the matter, with a view to a higher figure than 250—say 300.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH said, he would withdraw his Amendment in the hope that the noble Lord would consider the question before the Report.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. HARDCASTLE moved the omission of the words which required that the attendances should be "in not more than two schools."

Viscount SANDON said, that he had gone as far as he could in allowing the attendances to be divided between two schools in one year. If the children were sent to three or four schools the value of the education would be lost. He feared therefore it would be impossible for him to comply with his hon. Friend's suggestion. He could not, under any circumstances, agree to what he believed would be a most serious injury to the children.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT pointed out that it would be necessary to meet the cases of the shifting population in London and other large towns.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that if the children were continually changing the school the education would come to nothing.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. HARDCASTLE (for Mr. TORR) moved, in page 14, at end of table in sub-section (3), after line 43, to add—

> "Provided, That, in the case of a school district being a municipal borough in which for not less than three years before the commencement of this Act bye-laws have been in force requiring, as a condition of total or partial exemption of a child from attendance at school, that such child must have passed a standard of proficiency corresponding to the fourth standard of the Code of 1876, or any higher standard, the same or a corresponding standard of proficiency (but not exceeding the standard which, under this Schedule, will be required after four years from the commencement of this Act) shall be required for the purpose of a certificate under this Act enabling a child to be employed."

VISCOUNT SANDON said, that he considered the proposal a very valuable one, and he willingly accepted it, being obliged to his hon. Friend, and to his hon. Colleague, for having made it.

Proviso *agreed to.*

VISCOUNT SANDON moved, in page 15, line 12, after "1876," to insert "or such higher standard as may be from time to time fixed by the Education Department."

Amendment *agreed to.*

THE O'CONOR DON moved, in page 15, line 13, after "elementary," to insert "or other efficient."

Amendment *agreed to.*

VISCOUNT SANDON moved, in page 15, line 16, leave out "two hundred," and insert "three hundred," and page 15, line 16, after "attendances," insert "after five years of age."

Amendments *agreed to.*

MR. BIRLEY moved, in page 15, section 5, line 16, after "attendances," leave out "in not more than two schools," and in page 15, line 17, after "years," insert—

> "except where a child has been committed to an industrial or workhouse school, in which case such attendances may also be reckoned."

Amendments *agreed to.*

VISCOUNT SANDON moved, in page 15, line 17, at end of line insert—

> "or such larger number of attendances as may be for the time being fixed by the Education Department,"

and in page 15, line 31, at end of line insert as a fresh paragraph—

> "The Education Department may from time to time by order make such regulations and conditions in relation to the payment of fees under this Act by that department as they may think expedient.
>
> "The order shall provide that not more than ten per cent of the children in a public elementary school shall obtain in the same year certificates entitling them to the payment of fees, and that if the children qualified to obtain such certificates exceed the said percentage, those children who have attended the greatest number of times shall have the preference.
>
> "The order may make the continuance of the payment dependent upon the fulfilment of conditions, and shall provide that the continuance of the payment shall be conditional upon the child attending the school for not less than three hundred and fifty attendances in each year, and obtaining at the end of each year a certificate of proficiency in reading, writing, and elementary arithmetic according to a standard higher than the standard according to which it obtained the previous certificate.
>
> "The order shall further provide that the school, by previous due attendance at which the child was qualified for obtaining the payment of fees, and the school, the fees at which are paid by the Education Department, shall be a school, or department of a school, at which the ordinary payment in respect of the instruction of each scholar does not exceed sixpence."

The noble Lord stated that the proposed changes in this clause, relating to prize free education, were introduced, after considerations of various objections raised on both sides of the House, with a view to make the free education won by children in their 11th year more clearly a prize. They also provided that they should continue to work well and regularly at school if they were to retain the exhibition, and enabled the Department, if it found it necessary, to make stricter rules hereafter. These changes were the result of much consideration, and would, he thought, be great improvements, and remove all risks of danger from the school. Certainly, as it now stood, it could not be held to countenance general free education. It was undoubtedly a new plan, but it was one from which personally he anticipated very valuable results.

THE O'CONOR DON moved, in page 15, line 31, in Viscount Sandon's new paragraph, line 4, after "children," insert "presented for examination."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendments, as amended, *agreed to.*

VISCOUNT SANDON moved, in page 15, line 34, at end, insert—

"and where the attendance is at a certified industrial or certified day industrial school includes such attendance as may be from time to time directed for the purpose by a Secretary of State."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Schedule, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Schedule 2.

VISCOUNT SANDON moved to leave out the Schedule and insert the following Schedule:—

Second Schedule.

(Rules as to Local Committee.)

"(1.) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the school attendance committee may from time to time add to or diminish the number of members, or change the members of any local committee appointed by them, or may dissolve any such committee.

"(2.) A local committee shall, unless the school attendance committee appointing them otherwise direct, continue in office until the first meeting of that committee after the next annual appointment thereof, and thereafter until a new local committee is appointed.

(Rules as to School Attendance Committee and Local Committee.)

"(3.) Subject to any regulations made in the case of a school attendance committee by the council or guardians appointing it, and in the case of a local committee by the school attendance committee appointing it, the provisions of the Third Schedule of 'The Elementary Education Act, 1870,' with reference to proceedings of managers appointed by a School Board, shall apply to the proceedings of a school attendance committee and a local committee under this Act.

"(4.) A school attendance committee shall continue in office until the first meeting of the council or guardians appointing it after the next annual election of councillors and guardians, and thereafter until the new committee is appointed.

"(5.) A committee appointed by guardians shall be appointed at the first meeting after the annual election of guardians, or some other meeting fixed with the approval of the local government board for the purpose."

Motion *agreed to.*

Schedules 3 and 4 *agreed to.*

Preamble *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be *considered* upon *Thursday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 277.]

The O' Conor Don

MR. W. E. FORSTER hoped the Bill would be immediately printed, and that the noble Lord would be enabled on Thursday to give the House information as to the legal opinion in the Keynsham case.

VISCOUNT SANDON would be happy to do so.

BISHOPRIC OF TRURO BILL—[BILL 185.]

(*Mr. Assheton Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

CONSIDERATION. ADJOURNED DEBATE

[28th July.]

MR. W. E. FORSTER demurred to the measure being taken that day, as he believed the understanding had been that it should not be taken at the present sitting at all.

MR. W. H. SMITH dissented from the view which the right hon. Gentleman took as to the understanding which had been arrived at on the subject.

After some conversation, debate *further adjourned* till *Monday.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1874-5.

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [18th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5).

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. MONK desired to call the attention of the House to the practice which had grown up recently both at the Admiralty and the War Office of appropriating the excess of certain Votes, not exhausted, to other Votes for which the money had not been originally voted. It was true that the Appropriation Act gave power to the Treasury, in cases of emergency, to sanction the payment of such excesses, provided they did not amount in the aggregate to more than the sum voted for the Department in which the excess occurred, but the practice involved a very serious question. When the Admiralty took possession of these excesses in order to cover a deficiency, the control of Parliament was effectually withdrawn from the expenditure of the money, even though the sanction of the Treasury were obtained. In some instances, application was not made to the Treasury for its sanction for several months after the sums had been irregularly expended. He thought that before any surpluses were so appropriated a statement should be made by the Department that it was not in its power to have brought in a Supplementary Estimate, while Parliament was sitting. The Committee on Public Accounts adverted to the large deficit on the Navy Estimates for 1873-4, and expressed an opinion that the serious attention of the Admiralty should be given to the circumstance; and yet, notwithstanding their objections, a deficit of £238,000 had occurred in the Estimates for 1874-5. The Committee also observed, as they did in their Report of the previous year, that the circumstance of the insufficiency of the provision for the year was not brought under the notice of Parliament before the close of the financial year. He preferred this as a charge against the First Lord of the Admiralty. It was true that the First Lord said he was kept in the dark on the subject until it was too late to bring in a Supplementary Estimate. But whose fault was that? The Department was solely responsible for it. The Committee said in their Report—

> "The Accountant General was examined, and he accounts for the delay or omission to bring the deficit under the notice of Parliament, on the ground that it was hoped the deficit apparent in some Votes would be, on the whole, counterbalanced by the surplus on others, and that this hope was disappointed."

The Committee went on to say—

> "Your Committee think it right to call attention to the habitual use made by the Admiralty of the powers of applying, with the consent of the Treasury, the surpluses of certain Votes to meet deficiencies on others. This course of proceeding, unless strictly guarded, must to a great extent render nugatory the control of the House over the Votes."

That was the question he wished to bring before the House. The control of Parliament was taken away from the sums expended on the Navy. He regretted that the First Lord had left the House, when he knew that he intended to bring the question forward. The practice of which he complained was contrary to constitutional usage, whereas it was absolutely necessary that the House of Commons should keep a watchful eye over the public expenditure. Some alteration was imperatively called for in the 4th and 5th sections of the Appropriation Act, and there ought to be some further supervision, beyond that of the over-worked officials of the Treasury, in regard to the expenditure, which had not been sanctioned by Parliament.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, that as the point was likely to lead to discussion, and as the Prime Minister had stated that no Business to which there was any opposition would be taken, he would agree that the debate should be adjourned till Monday.

Debate *adjourned* till *Monday*.

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock till Monday.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 31*st July*, 1876.

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*—The Lord De Freyne, after the Death of his Father.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Cattle Disease (Ireland) * (195); Juries Procedure (Ireland) * (196); Poor Law Rating (Ireland) * (197); Savings Banks (Barrister) * (198); Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates) * (199); Winter Assizes * (200).

Second Reading—Parochial Records * (194).

Report—Notices to Quit (Ireland) * (188).

Third Reading—Convict Prisons (Returns) * (179); Isle of Man (Officers) * (174) and *passed.*

TURKEY—TREATIES OF 1856.

RESOLUTION.

LORD CAMPBELL: My Lords, some weeks ago I ventured to maintain that, before Parliament prorogued, Resolutions ought to be adopted on the Eastern Question, on a ground I then alluded to with brevity. Since the further Correspondence was delivered, when nothing of the kind appeared likely to emanate from any other quarter, at the end of last week I put down the Notice which the House observes upon the Paper. My Lords, looking to the feeling out-of-doors, and to what is going on to-night in the other House of Parliament, this Assembly would be placed so inconveniently, unless a Resolution was before it, that even if

I found myself alone, I should not be much censured. Without the slightest indiscretion I may mention that what I now propose has the concurrence of the noble Lord who recently supported me, our late Ambassador at St. Petersburg, and that he would have been here to express himself to-night, were he not absent in a remote part of the United Kingdom. As regards the further Correspondence, I shall not dwell upon it, as so many noble Lords are able to discuss it. However rich in the materials of which history is composed, it does not give birth to many new political conclusions. The most important revelation I have found in it is at Page 160, where it appears that the Prince of Montenegro virtually dictated the Memorandum of Berlin. The self-abasement of the Magnates who espoused that Memorandum could not go much further than when they raised the Prince of Montenegro to be the arbiter of Europe; and they ought, perhaps, no longer to suggest the grave invectives which have been occasionally lavished on them. My Lords, I at once approach the Resolution to be moved. In order to defend it, I shall only ask your Lordships to examine for a moment the circumstances in which we are placed, the results at which we ought to aim; and the degree to which the Resolution, if adopted, would be likely to conduce to them.

The general position is not very different from what it was at the end of June. The effort of the Servian vassal to make war upon his Suzerain, and annex a portion of his territory, seems to have pretty well collapsed. In Bulgaria, to which I may refer again, there is not any dangerous movement. But the former insurrection, openly, instead of secretly, abetted by the Prince of Montenegro, still continues. Among the Russian troops, according to the Continental Press, in certain garrisons excitement has been manifested. You still have at Constantinople men in power anxious to correct abuses in the Empire. The hostility of Austria to the Porte in the affair of closing Klek and Suttorina has been more openly exhibited, and that Power is seen, as before, to be directly influenced by Russia. Every now and then some new and fanciful encroachment on the Treaties of 1856 is meditated, whispered, or projected. The Foreign Office have been recently approached by that class of politicians who opposed the Crimean War, and have not much respect for the engagements it bequeathed to us. These circumstances, although but a scanty fragment of the moving panorama which surrounds us, suffice to point to the results which ought to be pursued. My Lords, they would appear to be to fortify the Government against those elements which might divert them from the line of policy and duty they have entered on; to encourage the reforms in Turkey, which such men as Lord Stratford de Redcliffe have long ago traced out, which such men as the Grand Vizier and Midhat Pasha have determined to inaugurate; and, last of all, to secure the maintenance of peace in Europe where it has not been hitherto disturbed.

That the present Resolution, if adopted, would tend to fortify the Government in the manner I have pointed to, is too obvious to require demonstration: that it would tend to the advantage of the races subject to the Porte is equally distinct upon the face of it: that it would tend to secure the maintenance of peace, so great an object to a country like Great Britain, rich in fame, contented with achievement, engrossed by industry, opposed to acquisition, requires but an easy course of argument to prove it. What would be most likely to beget hostilities during the autumn? Some ill-conceived adventure or experiment against the Treaties of 1856 on the part of the Power they restrain, which could not be regarded with indifference by the people of this country; or some defiance of public law such as occurred in 1870, which would be canvassed and resented in every fraction of society. What is most likely to bring about these sources of collision? Is it not the hope that they will meet with acquiescence and inertness, which such a Resolution as I move must damp and render difficult to cherish. How was the war in 1853 created? My Lords, it was created, as anyone may see who looks back to the proceedings of the time, by the silence and ambiguity of Parliament, which led the Russian Czar to misconceive, to misinterpret the intentions of the country. At that time the ill-judged reserve which decided the Czar to cross the Pruth was more excusable than it would be at present. After a peace of 40 years, statesmen had apparently forgotten how war could be averted, how it could be carried on, and how it could be finished with propriety; so that we had official speeches calculated to produce it, Estimates inadequate to feed it, negotiations when it reached the internecine phase, which only arms could settle. Again, in 1853, there were not any Treaties like the present to uphold; and it is not so easy for Parliament to indicate a line of action to the Government, as merely to declare or to inspire fidelity to the engagements which exist. My Lords, if the experience of 1853 is not to tell upon us at this moment, all history is a source of folly and deception, and those who have recorded it are among the greatest enemies of wisdom and of statesmanship. Such, however, is not the opinion of mankind at large upon a point which both in ancient and modern times has been habitually contemplated. I will, however, reason only from the knowledge to be acquired in our day upon the Bosphorus. It is easy to remark there that the policy of Russia upon the Eastern Question has its source at Constantinople, even more than at St. Petersburg. The former capital is given up to the exertions of diplomacy. In one street you have condensed the thoughts, the passions, and the rivalries of Europe. When the British Embassy is prevalent, your relations with the Powers hostile to the Porte are not immediately endangered, because that Embassy presents a formidable barrier. When the British Embassy is feeble in its influence, the Powers hostile to the Porte are constantly encouraged to create the tension, which is least to be desired. When is the British Embassy most capable? When it is possible to say that Parliament is undecided and irresolute in its adherence to the Treaties of 1856, or when it is not possible to say so? My Lords, it would be a waste of time to argue such a question. Let those who doubt, proceed and form their own opinions on the spot where only one can be arrived at.

Although no one will contend that such a Resolution can be dangerous, when it is shown to be the best expedient for averting war, some might be led, at first, to view it as superfluous. But as soon as they reflect on what has taken place within the last 12 months they must, I think, abandon that impression. Within that time, there have been many reasons why Parliament should be misunderstood, and its adherence to the Treaties should be doubted. We cannot overlook the animosity against the Porte, which the position of the bondholders excited. We cannot overlook the language of the individuals or the organs who sustained the outbreak in Herzegovina, when it began. We cannot assume that the excited patrons of those whom they consider as oppressed, the unconscious instruments of those who have fomented the disturbances, have not had some effect upon the Continent. No one who has lived anywhere within the great circumference in which the Eastern danger agitates the world, could possibly maintain that the attachment of the British Parliament to the Treaties of 1856 is so well known, as to make a declaration in their favour useless or inapposite. On the other hand, it is inconceivable that, at such a moment, Government should not desire Parliament to strengthen them in their maintenance of Treaties. Five Powers have been arrayed against them at Berlin. Except in time of war, the balance of Europe was never so completely overthrown. The scale which nearly kicks the beam is not entitled to repudiate the weight which Parliament can add to it. And if it does, discussion in the Houses is even worse than fruitless. You have the inconvenience and you miss the compensation.

My Lords, of the three grounds on which I recommend the Motion to your Lordships, its tendency to guard the interests of peace appears to me by far the most important. Other agencies may back up the policy of the Government against the influence which might enfeeble or deprave it. Other agencies may cherish and encourage the reforms by which the Sublime Porte would best consult its honour and prosperity. But to calm and to control the spirit of aggressive restlessness, from which calamities may spring, from which in former years they have sprung, it is difficult to point to any element whatever, except the moderating voice of Parliament in favour of the Treaties.

These arguments would probably suffice among those who hold that the Treaties ought to be maintained. But a party has been lately formed—unfortunately it is represented in this House—who, under guise of sympathy with the Bulgarians, openly assert that the Treaties ought to be abandoned; and even hint that Russia—in their eyes—would now be welcome on the Bosphorus. My Lords, I do not yield to this new party in sympathy with the Bulgarians—with whom, perhaps, I have had more intercourse than they have. The Bulgarians have sent me many pages on their wrongs that I might make them known to your Lordships, which I would certainly attempt to do, unless I were assured from another quarter that their complaints are now being thoroughly investigated, and every effort made to join humanity to firmness in opposing the disturbances, of which their country was the theatre. My Lords, the existence of the new party to which I have referred obliges me to trespass on the House rather longer than I should have done, and to hurry over one or two of the grounds on which it appears to me—in spite of their demand—the treaties ought to be adhered to.

Of course, the general dishonour of abandoning engagements need not be insisted on before an audience in which so great a sensibility exists upon the topic. But we cannot be unaffected by the circumstance that the country has no redundant store of credit upon foreign policy, from which it can afford to throw away a fraction with impunity. Whether the blame falls justly on Parliament, or on First Ministers, or on Secretaries of State, or on allies, or on adverse turns of fortune not to be surmounted, the result is beyond controversy. Great Britain has suffered deeply in her credit, since the period of that war of which Denmark was the victim. On such a point other nations are the only judges, and their voice is universal. What took place in 1870 heightened the impression; and what took place in 1871 was little likely to reduce it. Many other circumstances, I should not like to specify at present, require a long course of wise and honourable action to efface their recollection. Departure from the Treaties of 1856, so far as they survive, would be the overflowing drop in that cup of national disparagement, which does not need to be replenished. We cannot afford to crown a series of reproaches. But the noble Earl the Secretary of State, the Government, and the House itself, are quite as much impressed as I am on this topic.

My Lords, there is another ground on which the Treaties ought to be maintained, which does not appeal to sentiment of any kind, although sentiment and policy will not, perhaps, in this House appear entirely unconnected. It is the insuperable difficulty of any new arrangement on the Bosphorus which the Western Powers could accede to. Men who have spent many days and nights upon the Eastern Question will be the first to recognize the difficulty. In exact proportion as they learn something about Servia, the United Principalities, and Greece, they are convinced that none of them can become the centre of a new and civilized society, qualified to guard Constantinople for the interest of Europe. A new possibility is started by some reasoners. They urge that Austria ought to be established at that capital, and seem to think that there are none but very trifling objections to the consummation they aspire to. In one of his published speeches, Prince Bismarck gives a striking illustration of the defect which marks the class of intellects in which this kind of vision has originated. He compares them to persons who have never been in any highland country, and who, when they see a mountain large and naked to the eye, imagine there is nothing easier than by a straight and simple line to march directly to its summit. The crevices, the chasms, the water courses, and the glaciers, are utterly beyond their faculties to realize. In the case of the projectors I allude to, the first bar to their ascending stride, which utterly escapes them, is the Treaty which engages Austria in defence of Ottoman integrity. That, perhaps, might be surmounted. They have then to encounter the dual system recently established by Count Beust, which could scarcely work harmoniously in favour of their enterprize. Beyond that they are doomed to find among the Magyars the greatest fear of being englobed in a Slavonic population. In the next place, they meet in eminent Hungarians, such as General Klapka, whose views have lately been pronounced, the strongest possible objection to encroachment on the Porte, to which, in former days, they felt themselves indebted. Last of all, they come into collision with the Greek Patriarch at Constantinople—a force which co-exists with Mussulman, but might not be equally prepared to hail a

Roman Catholic ascendancy. If, indeed, in the inscrutable events the future may reserve, the Austrian Empire was in some degree divided; if germs we see already pushed into maturity; if Hungary was standing by itself, for anything we know the Vassal Principalities of Turkey might be led to gravitate towards it. But even if they did the problem would continue. In any case it is unnecessary to dwell upon contingencies beyond our power to secure. We are thus thrown back upon the Treaties of 1856, the more we labour for alternatives to fill up the void their disappearance would occasion.

My Lords, what course the late Government will take on this Motion is unknown to me. The course they ought to take is much more easy to determine. The late Government aspire to lead the Party who established the Treaties of 1856. They owe whatever influence they have, in no small degree, to past connection with Lord Palmerston. That which the world regarded as undue subserviency to Russia was among the causes of their downfall. There is now an opportunity before them of usefully disclaiming that propensity. But it is not to be admitted, for a moment, that the opinion of the late Government, whatever it may be, ought to decide the noble Earl the Secretary of State and his Colleagues on a question of this gravity. When much of Europe is disturbed, and more of it is menaced with disturbance; when an alliance fraught with peril starts out of the tomb, to which our greatest statesmen had consigned it, and luring France with Italy towards it, nearly drags Great Britain at its wheels; when out-of-doors fanatics utterly unversed in all the elements of history and of policy are endeavouring to fan a war between the Crescent and the Cross; the noble Earl the Secretary of State is not entitled to forego the aid which Parliament can offer him, because a section of political opponents may be ready to deprive him of it. The conflict in which he is engaged abroad, although a proud, is an unequal one. In referring to the concert of the three Powers on the 26th of June, the noble Lord the former Ambassador at St. Petersburg did not hesitate to tell your Lordships that the Holy Alliance had been set up again for revolutionary purposes. But an authority more grave, more elevated than the late Ambassador at St. Petersburg, had even previously come forward to interpret it. On this point I shall, as far as possible, avoid every phrase which scrupulous diplomatists would cavil at. But many of your Lordships must have seen during the first fortnight of December a speech which came from the Russian Czar himself—it was everywhere published—in which it was proclaimed that the three Emperors had re-established the alliance of their Predecessors, with a view to the objects for which it was originally formed. Such a speech ought, of course, to be regarded as the emanation of a Council. The Sovereign of Russia is not like public men, who, having nobody to tell them what to say, must often fall into imprudences, however great their effort to avoid them. It is worth while, therefore, to remember for what purposes that system was designed, which can be only judged by seeing of what purposes it was the instrument. My Lords, that system overthrew the Polish nationality; after a long interval it crushed the hopes of every patriot in Italy; it despatched in 1823 a French Army to Madrid, against the ineffectual voice of Parliament and the Foreign Office; in 1826 it imposed upon Great Britain the necessity of sending an expedition for the defence of Portugal into the Tagus; and last of all, by trampling on everything settled at Vienna, it put an end to the Republic of Cracow in 1847. These were its performances and purposes, and such a memory as that of the noble Earl the Secretary of State without more accurate description can recall them. My Lords, will the noble Earl, whose part it is to grapple with that system, wantonly decline, as far as possible, to arm himself against it? What is the defence the Resolution offers—if adopted—and what the armour it secures? My Lords, I wish to meet that question with precision. The noble Earl has had already to withstand demands from those three Powers, which he regarded as subversive of or injurious to Ottoman stability. If such a Resolution becomes the voice of Parliament, or even of your Lordships, demands of the same kind will be less likely to recur, and if they do recur, will be more easy to encounter.

My Lords, the essence of the case resides in that position. It would therefore be against my object, by dwelling upon other topics, to efface it. I have had to chose between two dangers; the danger of oppressing or exhausting the House by the materials which must occur to anyone whose thoughts during the last two years have been directed to the subject; the danger of appearing to present considerations which may be, not unconvincing, but inadequate, when you look to the magnitude of the interests at stake, of the commotions which environ us. I resolved to choose the latter danger, because the argument will not, I hope, depend on me. In this House there are present some, whose blood was shed, or whose lives were risked in the Crimea. There are present some to whom at least the names of Balaclava and Inkerman suggest the thoughts with which they ought to be connected. There are present some who recollect the objects for which that war was undertaken, the Treaties in which it closed and the necessity of guarding them at present. I leave the subject in their hands, and if they concur with me that Parliament has now a duty to perform, I engage them, more effectually than I have done to urge and encourage its performance.

Moved, "That this House, anxious for the welfare of the various races subject to the Ottoman Empire, and for an improved administration of their Government, is ready to support the measures which become necessary for upholding the Treaties of 30th March and 15th April, 1856."—(*The Lord Campbell.*)

EARL GRANVILLE: I am obliged to the noble Earl for having given Notice to call the attention of the House to this important subject, for if some other Peer had not done so I should have felt bound to undertake the task, so that an opportunity should be given for a subject of so much gravity being discussed in this House. With regard to the Resolution submitted by the noble Lord, however, I feel myself in some difficulty. I do not quite understand the drift of it—and I am sorry to say his speech has not fully enlightened me on the subject. My Lords, we all know that a civil war of a lamentable character is going on in some of the Provinces of European Turkey, a war which, if it continues—and no one can say that it will not do so, after a fashion—for a long time, will ruin those Provinces, will decimate their populations, and will confirm and increase the hatred which now exists between different races of different creeds. The noble Lord asks who is to blame for this war? There are, no doubt, historical causes over which the present generation has no control; but in these we cannot find the sole origin of the evil. It is impossible to deny that the Government of the Porte has much to answer for, and in answering the noble Lord's question, I confine my observations to the period which has elapsed since the Crimean War. The Crimean War had its origin in a quarrel between the Latin and Greek Churches, backed up respectively by France and Russia. I always thought that at the time too much was made of the Memoranda of two conversations held by the Emperor Nicholas—one in 1844 with the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and the Earl of Aberdeen; the other with Sir Hamilton Seymour, in 1853, after the difficulty about the Churches had arisen. The propositions laid down in the first Memorandum were—

> "The maintenance of the Ottoman Empire, the abstinence from selfish demands and from exclusive dictation, the joint action of the Powers to assist any one of them who had just cause of complaint, the duty of all the Powers to urge upon the Porte the conciliation of its Christian subjects, the use of the same influence to keep these subjects in allegiance, the agreement of Russia and England as to the course to be pursued in the case of a calamity befalling the Turkish Empire."

This declaration of principles, although it did not call for action on the part of the English Government, did not appear objectionable to the distinguished men to whom it was made or to their successors. The same views were communicated to Sir Hamilton Seymour in 1850 upon the latter's introducing the subject of the Eastern Question; but they were more strongly impregnated with the idea of the imminent fall of the Turk, and showed an equal desire to act with England. The cause of the Crimean War was the departure by the Emperor from the principles he had laid down in his two confidential conversations, aided by some other untoward circumstances. He took separate and private action, and attempted not only to assert what he considered his previous rights, but to extort from the Porte an acknowledgment of further rights on his part in regard to the Porte's Christian subjects. War ensued, and we were successful. I have no intention this evening of discussing the necessity, the justice, or the policy of that war, or the results of it upon the general policy of Europe. I shall confine myself to the position in which it left Turkey at its close. The war, as I have said, ended successfully, and it ended in a manner which is a remarkable exception to what in old times was thought one of the most general lessons taught by history—namely, that nothing is so dangerous for a weak State as to call in the armed assistance of one or more powerful nations. Excepting the general interest which all commercial nations had in the freedom of the Danube, and the general interest of Europe that the Turkish Empire should not fall a prey to the ambition of any one Power, we did not attempt to obtain one single object of a selfish character. The objects of the war were stated at the beginning of the war. They were distinctly recapitulated by Lord Clarendon and by Count Beust, after the failure of the Vienna negotiations to this effect:—That the exclusive right to interfere to a certain extent in the internal affairs of Provinces belonging to the Turkish Empire which Russia had in former years wrung from the necessities of the Porte should no longer be exercised by that Power; that the channel of the Lower Danube, and more especially the outlets of the river into the Black Sea, should no longer be subject to the exclusive control of Russia, but should, on the contrary, be confided to the superintendence of delegates appointed by other Powers as well as by Russia, and who should take measures for freeing and keeping free from obstructions the great water communication of Central Germany with the rest of the world; that the Turkish Empire should become part of the system of European equilibrium, and that means should be taken to put an end to the preponderance of Russia in the Black Sea; that the pretentions of Russia officially to protect the subjects of the Porte should be renounced; and that the Powers should use their influence to obtain from the Sultan, by an act of his own Sovereign authority, the confirmation and observance of the religious privileges of his Christian subjects. I hold that these objects were fully provided for by the Treaty of 1856. Since the beginning of the decline of the Ottoman Empire the Porte never held such a position in Europe as it did after the Treaty of Paris. Not only was the Empire made secure, as Lord Palmerston boasted, against naval, military, and diplomatic attacks, but it had taken the place in the system of the equilibrium of Europe, it was left with a very small Debt at a comparatively small rate of interest, and it had—under the advice and pressure, it is true, of the representatives of its co-belligerents at Constantinople, but with an entire reservation of the dignity of the Sovereign—issued a declaration as to the future government of the Empire, on principles which if fully carried out would have insured the prosperity, the happiness, and probably the contentment of its subjects. But it may be said, as it has so often been said out-of-doors, that this advantageous Treaty, and with it the object for which the Crimean war was waged, was abandoned by the late Government in 1871. I may be allowed to say one word on this point, because the ignorance about it is so great, that not only have some Members of your Lordships' House stated that in 1871 we gave up all the objects of the Crimean War, but my noble Friend (the Earl of Derby) has, in at least two despatches just presented, shown complete forgetfulness of the only point which was changed in the Treaty of 1856. He speaks of the Treaty of 1844 regarding the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles as having been confirmed by the Treaties of 1856 and of 1871; while the fact is that the Treaty of 1871 entirely altered that particular provision. I believe some of your Lordships will hear with surprise that of the four objects named in Lord Clarendon's despatch and carried out by the Treaty of 1856 three remain exactly as they were, with the additional solemn adherence of the Emperor of Russia—not under the pressure of the sword, but from his own free will; that the only point which has been changed was that portion of the third section to which I have referred which relates to the neutralization of the Black Sea, which in itself was an afterthought to the Conference of Vienna. That stipulation, which was denounced in Parliament at the time, and acknowledged by France, Germany, Austria, and Italy to be one which ought not to continued, had done its work. It had put an end to the naval preponderance of Russia in the Black Sea, and it had given time to Turkey to create a most powerful Navy, the only fault of which was that it was much too large for her finances. I saw that at a great meeting the other day Lord Palmerston was quoted as having prophecied the speedy end of the Treaty of 1856. He did no such thing. His allusion was to the particular clause of neutralization to which I have just alluded. Well, we substituted another, and I belive much more effectual, provision for the Turks, though less offensive to Russia. Instead of the Porte being able to bring the fleets of her allies into the Black Sea, after a declaration of war, it was agreed that she should have the power of doing so previous to such a declaration. The advantage of this provision is obvious. Under the Treaty of 1856, Russia could build any number of transports by which she might have conveyed troops to any point of Turkish territory without Turkey being able to oppose them by her own ships or the ships of allies, unless after a formal declaration of war. I hope your Lordships will excuse me for clearing up a point about which there has been so much misunderstanding. Turkey was by the Treaty of 1856 in a position with reference to the rest of Europe different from that which she formerly occupied. Now I will ask your Lordships how she has availed herself of this interval of comparative quiet and of absolute internal security. I do not mean that bad advice has not been given her from some quarters, or that we have not been foremost in pouring into the Treasury of the Sultan some £100,000,000 of money, which has had exactly the same corrupting and destructive effect as the spirits and rum supplied by civilized nations has upon the neighbouring savages; but there was no obligation upon the Porte to ask for bad advice, to accept loans which were out of proportion to the resources of the country. What, then, were some of the principal things promised in the famous Hatti-Humayoun of 1856? Mixed tribunals of justice, codes, and translations of codes; a sound fiscal system, measures against corruption, the establishment of banks, the promotion of roads, canals, and railways, and the invitation of foreign capital, so as to develop the the resources of the country. Have any of these promises been kept? Is it not true that they have been absolulely reversed? If you have any doubt, read the excellent despatch of the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) of June 26. It appears to me impossible to deny that the Government of the Porte is responsible for much that has happened. It is also quite true that there has been great activity to create discontent among others than the inhabitants of the districts which have actually revolted. But is this not always the case? What two greater, and I believe beneficial, events have happened than the unity of Italy and the unity of Germany? Have the Sardinians been unjustly accused of working up the latent discontent of the rest of Italy? Did the Prussians hold themselves absolutely aloof from the agitation which prevailed in other parts of Germany? As far as the Papers just presented go, they show most clearly that the agitation has not been due to foreign Governments, however difficult in some cases the action of some of these Governments are to follow, but to national movements and instincts; and could such national committees find more suitable materials for their work than those which had been manufactured for them by the Porte itself? And now I must say a few words with respect to the action of Her Majesty's Government, taking the date of the commencement of the negotiations for the Andrassy Note. The few words said by the noble Earl about a month ago on the subject of Her Majesty's Government having allowed the three Imperial Governments to take so completely the initiative in a matter which concerned ourselves and the rest of Europe have not supplied a sufficient answer. It is true that it appears by the Papers that some changes were effected by Her Majesty's Government in the Note, and we grumbled a little at the position in which we were placed. But I cannot help thinking that by a few direct explanations on our part before the Note was proposed at all, to the effect that in matters of so great a European importance we must insist on ourselves and other Powers taking their full share of the negotiations, we should have prevented the three Powers doing that which I believe they are now aware was a great mistake on their part.

Still, I believe Her Majesty's Government were right in agreeing to the modified form of the Andrassy Note. As to the Berlin proposals, I stated in the House a month ago that I could give no opinion till I had seen the document. After reading that Paper, I agree that it would not have been wise to accede to that document. There are two questions raised by it—the form of presenting it to us, and the substance of it. It appears from the despatch of Sir Andrew Buchanan that Her Majesty's Government were supposed to have resented the form, and I was certainly told at the time that the telegraph had announced to all Europe a considerable display of temper on the part of one of Her Majesty's principal Ministers. I doubt, however, whether the form was really meant to show disrespect to Her Majesty's Government, and was not merely the result of our having abandoned to the Three Powers the initiative in the matter, and the noble Earl in this House dissipated that idea. As to the substance, I think that as a whole it was not acceptable; but, as sometimes is the case, the reasons given for objecting to everything in it do not appear to me sound, and in no case do I think it was wise to drop the matter so completely. We were more Turk than the Turks themselves in objecting to the armistice which very soon after was proposed by the Turks, and objected to by the Christians. I do not see also how it would have been impossible for the Turks to rebuild the houses of the refugees, which, indeed, they had previously offered to do, and which would certainly have cost less money than making war on a great scale. But the chief objection I have is the way we washed our hands of further negotiation. I do not think the noble Earl was bound to produce a cut-and-dried counter-proposal, but he might have shown more readiness to discuss with all the other Powers some better plan than that proposed at Berlin. He was urged to do so not only by Russia, but also by Austria, Italy, and France. All along Germany has somewhat ostentatiously kept in the background. There is no reason to suppose she is unfriendly to this country, and it must not be forgotten how powerful she will be when the moment of decision comes. I hope we shall have some fuller explanation as to the refusal of a plan subsequently, as it appears, proposed by Russia, which consisted in giving Little Zvornick to Servia, making some concessions to Montenegro of a territorial character, and giving to Bosnia and Herzegovina an administrative autonomy, leaving the Sovereignty of Turkey intact—a plan on which the Russian Government pledged the pacification of the insurgent districts. I cannot say that the war has broken out in consequence of the refusal of the Berlin proposals, unaccompanied by any suggestions from Her Majesty's Government for any other policy. But on the other hand it is impossible for them to deny that this may be the case. The Prince of Montenegro alleges that it is so, and it is clear that by the complete refusal to concert anything, any moral claim upon Russia to continue her pressure upon Servia and Montenegro ceased to exist. There is no doubt that, rightly or wrongly, the impression made both upon philo-Turks and anti-Turks is the same—that the neutrality of Her Majesty's Government has been of a very benevolent kind towards the Turks, and that doubts still exist whether Her Majesty's Government felt to the full extent the obligations under which we are with respect to the Christian subjects of the Porte. When, in a few words which I said a month ago, I alluded to the influence which the Treaty of 1856 gives us in respect of the claims of the Christians to be fairly governed, I thought I remarked some appearance of dissent. This dissent was probably founded on the 9th Article of the Treaty of 1856. But what did Lord Palmerston say on the subject? I believe with perfect truth—

> "We felt that it would have been utterly inconsistent with the objects and principles laid down at the commencement of the war to frame the Treaty in such a manner as to give to the Allies an authoritative right of interference between the Sultan and his subjects. The Sultan, however, was perfectly willing to give to the Allies that sort of moral right which I think ought to be considered a sufficient security for the maintenance of the arrangements which were made, and which in themselves were satisfactory. The Firman is not included in the Treaty, and no Power, therefore, has a right to say, 'Here, by Treaty, I am entitled to come to you, and to tell you that you have violated your Firman with regard to this villager, or that priest, or that peasant, or that farmer, or that merchant, and I call on you by right of Treaty to alter your course; and I am to be the party to judge between you and your subjects and not

> yourself.' But the Treaty having recorded that that Firman has been issued by the Sultan, it is perfectly plain to my mind that it cannot be revoked. In fact, that it should be revoked is a thing which I hold to be as impossible almost, morally speaking, as that the sun should go backwards. That which is more possible, however, is that, for some time to come, cases will arise in which the Firman will not be fully executed by the authorities of the Porte in distant provinces and in places not immediately under the view of the Consuls; and if that should occur, the fact of the Firman having been adverted to in the Treaty, and the issuing of it having been recorded in the Treaty, would give to the Allied Powers that moral right of diplomatic interference and of remonstrance with the Sultan which I am perfectly convinced would be quite sufficient to accomplish the desired purpose."—[3 *Hansard*, cxlii. 125-6.]

If Lord Palmerston was wrong in his interpretation of the rights we have to see such solemn promises executed, and without which the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire for any time is impossible, in what a position the co-belligerent Powers were placed by the Treaty of 1856 as regards the Christians. We took absolutely from them the possibly interested, but very effective, support of Russia, and have substituted nothing of value in its stead. I am encouraged to hope by some of the later despatches that the noble Earl is alive to this obligation, and it is to a certain degree confirmed by a remarkable speech, which has given great satisfaction, addressed to a deputation some days ago at the Foreign Office. Before touching upon that speech, I feel bound to ask the noble Earl to give us some explanation why the information given in it was not afforded to this House, and at an earlier period. In that speech the noble Earl said—

> "From the day it became evident that the crisis had arrived, that war would come to pass, we stated that all reserve was at an end."

But this day arrived weeks ago, and yet day after day we were left without papers and without information, and in consequence of this absence of information, the most alarming rumours prevail. The next bad things to war—namely, rumours of war—were rife. It was announced, not only in England, but in all Europe, that we had checkmated Russia, not only by our judicious refusal of the Berlin Memorandum, but especially by the menacing demonstration in Besika Bay. Holders of Russian stock in this country lost from 8 to 15 per cent in their desire to realize, and trade all over Europe was sensibly affected—not to mention the angry feelings created both in this country and in Russia. Well, on the 14th of July the noble Earl entirely extinguished all these false alarms. He explained how the Ambassadors had met together, how they had consulted for the common safety, and unanimously agreed as to the expediency of obtaining for unoffending persons, and as a security against disorder, such armed force as was at hand. He said the initiative was taken from Constantinople:—and it is well that you should recollect, and it is not generally understood in this country—it was not a step taken by this country alone. It was a step taken by us simply as one of, and acting in concert with, the other Great Powers. I think you will admit that the facts do not bear the inference which has popularly been drawn from them. And the noble Earl gave an assurance which would be more completely reassuring if he had not promised in last autumn that we should hear nothing more about the insurrection in Herzegovina; that—

> "So far as is possible to forecast the future of events, I think it is the most impossible thing in the world that in consequence of anything that is now passing within the limits of the Turkish Empire a general European war should ensue."

I have nothing to gainsay in this—nothing could be more complete or more satisfactory than the assurances. But why were they not given before? Passing over earlier opportunities, the noble Lord (Lord Campbell) called the attention of this House to Turkish affairs on the 26th of June, nearly three weeks before this speech. Lord Hammond blamed the Government for having allowed others to take the initiative, but he praised other acts of Her Majesty's Government, especially the pregnant measures of sending the Fleet to Besika Bay as an intimation of our determination to protect Turkey. Lord Napier, in an able speech, arguing for the Porte against the Christians, was particularly laudatory of the movement of the Mediterranean Fleet, stated the objections that might be raised against it as a premature menace, and refuted them according to his views. At the end of the debate I said a few words in reference to the object with which the Fleet had been sent to the Mediterranean, and asked whether it had been sent as an intimation to Russia, as a hint to the Porte, or as a defence of the Christians? The noble Earl spoke: he declined giving information, on the ground that a Minister's words might be misconstrued, and that the Papers were not in our hands. But when he made his speech to the deputation no Papers had been then presented, and nothing could be more intelligible than the words of the noble Earl. In one part of that able and successful speech the noble Earl lamented a want of knowledge of the wishes of his employers, the public. I have no right to speak for the public; but I hope I shall not be thought presumptuous if I state what my own wishes are. I entirely approve the noble Earl's policy of non-intervention, and of his, at the same time, not binding himself to non-intervention in any possible contingencies. I approve his taking no steps to destroy the Treaty of 1856 or to accelerate the fall of the Ottoman Empire. If all Europe were agreed, it would not be an easy task to settle the problem of what should take its place. With the different ambitions and interests that exist, to attempt to do so in anticipation of events would be full of danger. On the other hand, I trust that he will hasten rather than delay the moment when Europe in concert can by diplomatic action put an end to a state of things which is fatal for the Christians, ruinous to the Turks, and which the longer it lasts may the more readily give rise to European complications; and in any such arrangements I trust that every care will be taken to secure the welfare and good government of our fellow-religionists in Turkey. Where the inhabitants of a Province are chiefly Christians, there can be no real difficulty in allowing them a share of government, subject to the Sovereignty of the Porte; where the races are more equal in number the difficulty is great, but ought not to be insuperable. What Lord Dufferin effected in Syria cannot be impossible in other parts. But of one thing I feel certain—that the people of this country will not be satisfied if, as the result of the Crimean War and of our diplomatic exertions at the present crisis, they find the Christian subjects of the Porte in as bad or worse a position than they undoubtedly have been during the last 20 years. In conclusion, I have to thank your Lordships for the attention with which you have listened to me, and to ask your indulgence for my having thus laid my views on this important question before you.

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, I think it well that I should not delay to comment upon what I admit to be the very moderate, fair, and candid speech just delivered by the noble Earl (Earl Granville). First, however, I must advert to the address of my noble Friend who opened this debate. My noble Friend approved entirely of what the Government had done, and gave some advice, to which I listened with respect, as to what we ought to do in the future. During his speech I felt in the agreeable position of the gentleman who is waiting to return thanks for his health at a public dinner rather than in that of a Minister who is about to defend his policy against attack. I thank my noble Friend for the courtesy and friendliness of his remarks, and may say in passing that I think he would do better not to press to a division the Motion of which he has given Notice. Though he hoped the Motion would receive the unanimous support of this House, there are some of your Lordships who might dissent from it; and I think that when, so far as I can see, we appear for all practical purposes to be of one mind, it would be a pity that any form of words should be laid before us, possibly leading to an appearance of disunion which really does not exist. There is another reason why I think my noble Friend should not press his Motion. He asks your Lordships to express your readiness "to support the measures which become necessary for upholding the Treaties" of 1856. Now, in the abstract I do not dissent from that declaration of opinion; but I think if such a Resolution went forth to the world as being adopted by this House, it would create an impression for which I hope and believe there is no foundation—namely, that there is some imminent danger of those Treaties of 1856 being broken. The assertion by your Lordships of a Resolution to defend them would imply an intention on the part of some Power to break them, and would be something in the nature of a defiance addressed by this House to foreign States. I pass now from the speech of the noble Lord who moved the Resolution to the remarks of my noble Friend opposite (Earl Granville). In his opening observations he laid down many propositions from which I certainly should not dissent. I agree with him that it is desirable that this subject should be brought before the House. I agree with him in regretting the unhappy war which has broken out, and in hoping that it will remain localized, at least, if not shortly brought to an end. I agree with him in thinking that there have been on the part of the Turkish Government great and grievous faults of administration during the last 20 years, and that these faults have contributed in some not inconsiderable degree to the insurrectionary movements which we have witnessed during the last 12 months. Upon this point, however, I am bound to make one remark. I do not doubt that maladministration has contributed to bring about those insurrectionary movements; but I do not think we should take a just or accurate view of the situation if we ascribed them wholly or even mainly to this cause. There is no question that there has arisen among the European subjects of the Porte a very strong feeling in favour not only of better administration, but of independence. Now, this feeling, to whatever extent it exists, obviously would not be removed by better government. I do not think it necessary to go back to the year 1844, or to the conversation—which, as we all remember, made so great an impression—between the Emperor Nicholas and Sir Hamilton Seymour in 1853, or to the acts and general policy of the English Government at that period. I do not assert—I have never been one of those who did assert—that the results of the Crimean War have been altogether futile. Whatever may have since occurred, we now have, at any rate, a state of things which could not be said to exist at the time when that war was undertaken—we have a general feeling existing among the States of Europe that the future of the Turkish Empire is a question to be settled not by aggressive movements on the part of any one Power, but if possible, and as far as possible, by a general assent of European nations. I do not care to discuss—I do not think it important for our present purpose to discuss—the effect of the modification of the Black Sea Treaty in 1871; still less shall I defend myself against the charge of verbal inaccuracy to which my noble Friend has thought it worth while to allude. I shall be very glad if what I say and do is subject to no graver imputation. If it were worth while, I could defend not only the substance but the words of the statement mentioned by my noble Friend. But there are matters of greater importance to be dealt with. I come now to the real gist of my noble Friend's speech. His first criticism is founded upon the circumstances which attended the presentation of the Andrassy Note; and he said, if I understood him rightly, "Why did you allow that Note to be framed by the Three Powers without interference or remonstrance? Why did you not interpose at an earlier date and tell them that England required to be consulted?" My answer is, that we never at any time contemplated that that declaration of policy would be issued by the Three Powers alone, without obtaining the consent of the other European Powers. Whether it was framed in the first instance by one or two or three Powers was a matter of comparatively small importance, provided always that—as undoubtedly happened in this case, though not in a later instance—ample time and opportunity were given to us to consider whether we would or would not give it our support, and, if so, upon what conditions. I think that to wait until it was brought before us, knowing that it must be so brought before us, was a policy more prudent and more wise than if we had insisted on knowing beforehand what the three Cabinets were planning among themselves. The test in such matters is the result. Did we lose any influence or authority in the Councils of Europe? I will venture to say precisely the contrary. We considered the matter, and in consequence of our criticism, modifications were introduced into the Note. As a matter of fact I can vouch for this—and many of your Lordships know it too,—the general anxiety and feeling of uneasiness throughout Europe when it was believed that our support to that proposition would be withheld was very great; and the feeling of relief in every European Cabinet was correspondingly great when it was known that, with certain modifications, it had received our assent. My Lords, I do not believe that the course we pursued was one which diminished the influence or power of this country. Nor do I think it unreasonable that Austria and Russia—at least that Austria—should take the initiative in a matter of this kind. Whatever may have occurred since that time, the insurrection in part of Bosnia was then purely local; and it undoubtedly affected Austria as a Power bordering upon Turkey more than any other State. The Cabinet of Vienna, then, had the best right of any to take the initiative; and it had a better opportunity than any of us had of knowing what was really passing on the spot, and what was the real explanation of many circumstances which to us, at a distance, were entirely obscure. I pass on to the question of the Berlin Memorandum; and upon that question I understand my noble Friend to say that he does not dissent from the course we adopted. He thinks we were right in not giving it our adhesion, but were not fortunate in the reasons we gave for taking such a course.

EARL GRANVILLE: What I said was that I did not think the noble Earl was bound to produce a cut-and-dried counter-proposal, but that he might have shown greater readiness to discuss with the other Powers some better plan than that proposed at Berlin.

THE EARL OF DERBY: That is a separate proposition. First, my noble Friend says, "Your conclusions may be right, but your reasons are wrong;" and secondly, he maintains that we were wrong in not submitting counter-proposals. Naturally, when a proposal is made consisting of a variety of separate propositions you must take them one by one and state the objections which occur upon each. If the proposals for bringing back the refugees to their homes had stood alone, I do not at all say that we might not have got over the objections entertained against that particular proposal. But it was a question of calling on the Porte to repair all the damage done, not only by their own troops, but by the Insurgents also. It was proposed that the money to be expended should be placed in the hands of committees on which the representation of the Turkish Government would have been extremely feeble, and which would therefore have no inducement to limit the expenditure, but many inducements in the contrary direction. In point of fact, the proposal was that the Turkish Treasury should be opened, and that committees whose sympathies could not be expected to be with the Turkish Government should be allowed to help themselves at their discretion. I think there is something to be said against that proposition. Then the noble Earl said, "Why did you object to the armistice? You are the friends of the Turks, who accepted the armistice, while, on the other hand, it was the Insurgents who refused it." I need hardly explain that there is a very wide difference between accepting a proposition on your own account and forcing it on somebody else. We never said it would necessarily be a mistake for the Turks to grant an armistice. We thought that the solution of that question depended to a great extent upon military as well as upon civil considerations, and that to force an armistice on the Turks would have been a very one-sided proceeding. There is no doubt that the officers of the Turkish force would have observed their engagements; but the Insurgents have not the same discipline—they have no one chief who is responsible for the whole body; and it seems probable that an armistice, if agreed upon, would have been strictly maintained on the one side and entirely disregarded on the other. I may observe, in support of that view, that no mention is made in the Correspondence, as far as I recollect, of any means to be taken to insure that the armistice should be strictly observed by the Insurgents. I do not, however, lay much stress on these points, for the real and the insuperable objection to the Memorandum is the paragraph with which it concludes. In substance the paragraph says:—"These are the terms we offer now, provided the Insurgents will accept them; but if they do not want to accept them, they need not do so, and we will then see what more we can offer." It seemed to us that a proposition like that would be considered by the Insurgents as a direct encouragement to refuse whatever was proposed. Again, the noble Earl asked why we allowed the negotiations to go off, without making a counter-proposition. My Lords, I am happy to believe that any feeling of soreness and irritation which may have been caused by our action in the matter has long ago subsided, but at the moment there undoubtedly was a certain soreness and irritation; and considering that the three Northern Powers had accepted *en bloc* the propositions embodied in the Berlin Memorandum, it was hardly reasonable to expect that they would at once have turned round, thrown over the Memorandum, and accepted a proposal on a different basis, if we had had such a proposal to make. With regard to the negotiations, I may remark that I never, either in speech or in writing, discouraged further propositions on the subject. At a rather later date, it is true, I made a statement on the condition in which matters then were, and I said it seemed to me to be hopeless to expect to bring about an understanding with the Powers. It came shortly to this—that the Insurgents appeared to be determined to accept nothing short of independence, and that the Government of the Porte, while, no doubt, it would willing to grant large administrative reforms, would never consent to grant independence. Therefore, it seemed hopeless to attempt to do anything until one party or the other abated its pretensions. If the military operations resulted in favour of the Insurgents, no doubt they would have a stronger position for coming before Europe and asking for intervention in their favour; if unsuccessful, they would probably have been willing to accept something less than that which they had, in the first instance, asked for. But while one party wants independence and the other will grant almost anything short of that, but will not concede that, it seemed for the moment that no room for mediation was left. Now, my Lords, I pass on to the comment of the noble Earl on the speech which I addressed at the Foreign Office to a deputation of Members of Parliament. My noble Friend asks why my statement was not made before, and why it was not made in Parliament? With regard to the first question, I can only repeat what I said then—namely, that I thought a discussion on the subject would probably have an unfavourable effect in reference to the maintenance of peace, and that therefore it was not desirable that such a discussion should be raised as long as there was a hope of peace being maintained. But from the hour when the war was declared I felt that Parliament and the country should know as soon as possible all that could be known on the subject, and I directed all these Papers to be prepared for publication with the least possible delay. As for my not having made the statement in this House, I think it would not have been a usual course for a Minister who was not questioned and not confronted by any Motion to volunteer a general statement. As to a general discussion, in the first place, none was proposed; nor do I think it would have been desirable to commence such a discussion in this House until your Lordships were in possession of the information supplied by this Correspondence; but, of course, I knew that Parliament could not and ought not to separate without having an opportunity of going fully into the whole question. The circumstance of my statement having been elicited from me at the Foreign Office and not here was due to mere accident, because the question addressed to me came in the form of a deputation, and not in the form of a Parliamentary interpellation. If the same questions had been put to me in this House, as they were at the Foreign Office, I should of course have answered them, and in the same sense. I have nothing whatever to add to the statement I then made. Well, the noble Earl (Earl Granville) proceeded to comment on the summons of the Fleet to Besika Bay. At that time the wildest rumours were afloat as to what might or might not be the intentions of the Great Powers; and, although, as a matter of fact, the revolution which had set in at Constantinople was a bloodless and a tranquil one, yet no man could say what might at any moment occur, and it was quite on the cards that the events which led to the deposition of the late Sultan might have given rise to a sanguinary revolt. No one could, in the circumstances, foresee what fanaticism might bring about, or what might be produced by a feeling of rage or despair on the part of the population. In such a state of things it seemed to us that the presence of a British Fleet could not fail to have a satisfactory influence. It exercised a certain moral control; it also served to dispel those unfounded apprehensions which were undoubtedly entertained by a large portion of the population; and it is absolutely true that the presence of that fleet in Besika Bay was a protection to the Christian population, and tended to prevent any local outbreak. If the result of our bringing the combined fleets to Besika Bay was to increase, as I firmly believe it did, the naval influence of England, an influence which could only be used in the maintenance of peace, I cannot think that is a result of which we have any cause to be ashamed. I pass on now to almost the only other subject to which my noble Friend alluded. He has expressed his approval generally of the course of proceeding which has been adopted by Her Majesty's Government. He agrees with us in our policy of non-intervention, and he also concurs with us in thinking that, considering our antecedents and our Treaty obligations, we ought not to do anything which would precipitate the fall of the Turkish Empire. As to the main features of our policy, there is, indeed, very little difference between us and the noble Earl; but he made some remarks as to what in diplomatic phrase is called a "benevolent neutrality," to the justice of which I cannot subscribe. I should be glad to know on what particular passage of my despatch it is based. What we have endeavoured to do has been to hold the scales as equally as possible. No man can judge as to the result of what he does; but he may be allowed to know his own intention; and we have endeavoured to deal with this question in a spirit as nearly judicial as possible—to deal with both sides in the spirit of equal justice. As to the obligations imposed on us by Treaty to do what in us lies to protect the subject-races of Turkey from misgovernment, the obligation to interfere for the protection of the Empire from external attack implies a corresponding duty of control. There is an Article in the Treaty, no doubt, which seems to preclude such interference, but I read that Article as not in any way forbidding a joint intervention in the interests of humanity, the intention clearly being to guard against exclusive interference by any one Power. I will not say anything now as to the course of policy which we propose to adopt in the future. That must, in a great measure, depend on the result of the military operations which are at present going on, and upon the possibility of obtaining the co-operation of the other Powers. As to the observations which the noble Earl made with reference to autonomy, I think if he will only look at that which I have written he will find that it contains no phrase which would justify him in attributing to me the determination at which he appears to suppose I have arrived. The great difficulty in the way of autonomy is that of giving self-government to a semi-barbarous population—half Christian, half Mahomedan—who have not many ideas or interests in common. I do not mean to say that that is an insuperable difficulty, but it certainly is one of a very grave character; and I cannot help thinking it would be well as far as possible to avoid that phrase autonomy, because it seems to me to be of all phrases one of the most elastic. We shall endeavour to act impartially. We shall endeavour as far as possible to act, not in an isolated manner, but in co-operation with the other Powers. We shall do all that we can, in short, to bring about, if we can, a permanent and satisfactory settlement of the Eastern Question. I need not detain your Lordships any longer, because all I have to say on this point will be found pretty clearly stated in the Papers to which I have called your Lordships' attention.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY observed that if much had not been said in other places which required contradiction he should have preferred not to have troubled their Lordships with any observations, feeling confidence and satisfaction at the conduct of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Any dissatisfaction that might be felt at some passages in the noble Earl's reply to the large deputation which lately went to him was removed when it was remembered that it was necessary to appease that deputation and those whom it represented—foremost amongst whom must be reckoned Mr. Bright, whose language at the time was one of the principal causes of the Emperor Nicholas crossing the Pruth before the Crimean war, and whose language now again was misleading public opinion here and in Russia. If it were a love for humanity which was actuating those persons who formed the deputation, they had a singular way of showing their benevolence; for whilst none of them paused to reflect on the criminality of the Servian Government in invading Bulgaria, notwithstanding the alleged remonstrances of the Russian and Austrian Governments, or the criminality of the Austrian Slavs, amounting to many thousands of ex-soldiers of the Gränzen regiments, who had gone across their frontier in such large numbers, they had not scrupled to encourage these men in their unprovoked invasion of the peaceful territory of a neighbouring State; and the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury), whose whole career had been actuated by humanitarian feelings, forgot these so far as to join in the clamour for the expulsion — in other words, the extermination — of four or five millions of people from Turkey in Europe — forgetting that such language from a person of his weight must embitter the present struggle, and that if the result which he professed to desire were attained it would probably be attended by the extension of all the horrors of a war of insurrection to our own peaceful territory of India. The noble Earl, when he wished to see the Russians on the Bosphorus, was also strangely forgetful of the flogging of the Polish nuns, of all the Poles that had been sent to perish in Siberia and the mines of Nertschinsk, and of the quite recent massacre of United Greek Ruthenes in Russian Poland. With regard to another noble Earl (Earl Russell), for whom he shared with their Lordships the veneration all felt for him, he would only say that he was very inconsistent, for in 1862, when Foreign Secretary, Earl Russell opposed the cession by the Porte of Belgrade and her other fortresses in Servia on the ground that

> "It was impossible for Her Majesty's Government to ask the Sultan to concede to his enemies the means of assailing the security of his Empire."

The noble Lord then referred to some figures and statements in a letter of Aly Suavy Effendy to a French newspaper, showing that more Mussulman houses than Christian houses had been burned in the district of Tatar Bazarjik by the agents for getting up an insurrection, and that the Turks would not have burned their own houses and villages. So long as the present state of affairs continued it was to be desired that, as far as concerned Turkey, Her Majesty's Government should persist in their present course. The Porte was able to meet its enemies, and no fear need be entertained that it would wish to inflict a too severe chastisement upon the Servians — for it had already used the language which was traditional to it with regard to insurrections—namely, that the people, the mass of insurgents, had been led away and deceived, and that the leaders alone were guilty. But as a well-wisher of the Austrian Empire, which was so necessary to the balance of power in Europe, he would venture to entreat the Secretary of State to use all his influence to withdraw Austria from the dangerous incline on to which she had been brought by the action of some of her subjects. Austria's worst and least valuable subjects were those that lived near the frontier of Bosnia. They were worse than Fenians, and the complaints they had been in the habit of making against Austria were more frivolous than those of the Fenians against England. In 1863 the Croats at Agram were agitating for the abolition of the Gränzen regiments, which were abolished four or five years ago; they pretended that the Italian War had cost Croatia 50,000 widows. It was hardly probable that Croatia had furnished 50,000 soldiers in that war, still less that 50,000 had been killed, and if that number had been killed they would not all be married men. These Croats also accused the Magyars of being an ignorant Asiatic horde. But the worst feature for Austria was, that the three Provinces of Dalmatia, Croatia, and Syrmia claimed to be three united kingdoms, and to be able and desirous of forming a separate and independent State. This was not the conversation of the market-place, but of persons of position. In 1869, at the time of the Vatican Council at Rome, it fell to his lot to have to collect the signatures of some of the leading Bishops to a document, the object of which was the restoration of respect for the Law of Nations. When he asked Bishop Strossmayer, the Bishop of Syrmia, to give his signature along with the other Bishops, he refused, saying, "I cannot sign that; it would impede, or clog, my action in Bosnia; I would willingly shed my blood to liberate my brothers in Turkey." This was not a fitting speech for a Christian Bishop. He was, however, one of the most contumacious opponents of the Pope and the great majority of the Council, and, though later he made his submission to the Holy See, it appears that it was only skin deep, since according to some newspaper reports, he had lately been active in promoting the invasion of Bosnia by the Croat bands—acting thus in opposition to the precepts of the Holy See against the insurrection, which had been received and obeyed by the rest of the Catholic clergy in those parts. With such dispositions on the part of its subjects, it was not surprising that Austria should have been hurried on further than was safe for herself or justifiable as regards her conduct towards her neighbour. But unfortunately the Austrian Government had allowed its neutrality to be violated in a way that could not be excused by the irregular action of its subjects in remote mountainous districts. She had also made a great blunder in closing the port of Klek to the Ottoman ships, on the pretence of observing neutrality, for the obligations of neutrality pointed the other way. For it was the Austrian Plenipotentiary, Count Buol, who in the 14th and 15th Protocols of the Treaty of Paris of 1856, described Montenegro as a Province of the Ottoman Empire, and elicited from the Russian Plenipotentiary admissions to that effect which were considered satisfactory by the other Plenipotentiaries. The Republic of Ragusa had placed itself under the protection of the Porte as early as the reign of Orkhan the second Sovereign of the Ottoman dynasty. The strips of land coming down to the sea at Klek and Sutorina were formally ceded by Venice to the Ottoman Empire for the protection of Ragusa by the Treaty of Carlovitz in 1699, when Venice also ceded Lepanto, and razed the fortifications of Prevesa. This cession was confirmed by the Treaty of Passarowitz in 1718; and in the negotiations of Tilsit and Campo Formio, the dependence of Ragusa on the Ottoman Empire was recognized. Austria only acquired Ragusa by the Treaty of 1815, but she acquired it subject to the rights of third parties, and she could not make a *mare clausum* of the gulf at the head of which Klek stood, because one side of that gulf was formed by the peninsula of Sabioncello, which formed part of the Ragusan territory, which was a dependency of the Ottoman Empire. The desire of Austria to shut out the Turks from the use of their port of Klek had, however, been due as much to commercial as to political motives, for if the port of Klek were open it would afford ingress and an outlet to goods for Bosnia and Herzegovina, which at present had to pass through Austrian custom-houses in Dalmatia. But since the Austrian and Russian Governments both professed to have used all their influence with Servia to prevent her from invading Bulgaria, those Governments could not, with any show of justice, step in to prevent the natural consequences of the Servian rebellion, nor show their disappointment at its ill success, without adopting the acts of their subjects who were carrying on what was called the insurrection of Turkey, and of which they must be supposed to repudiate the responsibility. In his opinion, the safest course for the Secretary of State to pursue was to act as he had done with regard to the Berlin Memorandum, and to keep out of Conferences.

THE MARQUESS OF BATH regretted that the House had heard from the noble Earl the Secretary of State no expressions of sympathy either with those feelings of our common humanity, or our common Christianity, which would seem to be involved in the question under discussion. The noble Earl professed to attempt to take a judicial position between the two parties; but he had not told the House on what principles of justice he would feel bound to decide, or in what manner he proposed to act towards a rule which was, perhaps, the most brutal that had ever disgraced the earth. The country had shown most positively that it would not have any fresh Crimean War, with all the misfortunes and sacrifices with which that war was identified, while it had a certain amount of jealousy of the Russian power in the Black Sea. Beyond that, however, there was a strong feeling of horror and indignation against these violations of the laws of humanity and philanthropy; and when it came to know the truth with regard to the atrocities of the Turks in Bulgaria—the thousands of men and women massacred, the hundreds of children mutilated or sold for slaves—and if it should turn out that the Government had, in any way, supported the Power that had committed these atrocities, there would be such a feeling of indignation excited as would be dangerous to its own stability. The noble Earl said that it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to interfere by force of arms either on behalf of the Turks or of the Servians, but he had not told them what he would do if some other Power interfered on behalf of the Insurgents. If there should be such an interference, and the Government, either by diplomatic notes or threats, or force of arms, should prevent such an interference, it would be held by the country to be action in support of the Turkish Government, with all the atrocities of which it had been now and aforetime guilty, and of which it would always be guilty so long as it had power over Christians. The excitement such a state of things would arouse in the country would not easily be pacified. Every Church in England, whether High or Low, and every chapel, of whatever sect, would all unite in protesting against the power of England being made use of to support such a blood-stained and savage rule.

Lord HAMMOND said, that he agreed with the noble Lord who opened the debate (Lord Campbell) as to the importance of the Treaties of March 30 and April 15, 1856; but he would have been glad if, in framing his Resolution, he had given more distinct utterance to the obligations under which the Porte rested with respect to its Christian subjects. It seemed to him that this country, in common with the other Powers who were parties to the Treaty of 1856, was entitled to expect that the Porte should treat its Christian subjects with justice and moderation, and should adopt a system of administrative reform, which would remove the just causes of dissatisfaction and complaint which now disturbed not only the Christian, but also the Mussulman races under its rule. It was to be hoped that the Porte, if successful in the present war, would not seek to modify or set aside the privileges which Servia had heretofore been allowed to enjoy. Turkey, indeed, might well be satisfied with the penalty which, if defeated, the Prince and the people of Servia would have to pay for their wanton and unprovoked aggression, without seeking to impose upon them other penalties which would infallibly provoke discussion and objection on the part of the other Treaty Powers. Allusion had been made to the 9th Article of the Treaty of 1856, in which it was said that the communication of the Hatti Humaioun to the Powers gave them no right of interference in the relations between the Sultan and his subjects; but the first clause of that Article recorded the constant solicitude of the Sultan for all classes of his subjects without distinction of religion or race, and specifically his generous intentions towards the Christian population of his Empire; and so far amounted to a distinct engagement on the part of the Sultan. From the Papers now before the House it was clear that, notwithstanding the many grievances under which the Christian population of European Turkey undoubtedly labour, they would not have risen in arms against the authority of the Sultan had they not been instigated to do so, directly or indirectly, by foreign agency. But while they deplored, as all must do, the ruin, misery, and loss of life which had overwhelmed the Christian population in certain parts of European Turkey, they could not conceal from themselves how great a share in producing them must, as set forth in the Correspondence, be attributed to the wanton outrages committed by bands of Insurgents on their peaceable fellow-Christians in order to compel them, from want of the necessaries of life, and of their homes laid waste by their co-religionists, to take part in the insurrection, in which otherwise they had no desire to engage. Neither must they ignore the fact of outrages no less wanton having been committed on Mussulmans by insurrectionary bands; or the necessary consequence that unprovoked outrage could not fail to engender retaliation on the part of the sufferers, and that a conflict of race thus commenced must be inevitably stained with revolting atrocities and cruelties. Her Majesty's Government appeared to have spared no pains to impress on the Porte the necessity of repressing, in the strongest manner, the wanton and vindictive cruelties which had disgraced their Mussulman perpetrators; and it was but fair to say that the Porte had shown no reluctance to control and chastise the infuriated Mussulmans of the Northern Provinces, who had been connected with outrages on the Christian subjects of the Sultan. It was not, however, only the immediate repression of the conflict of extermination going on before their eyes with which they had to deal, but rather to provide against the recurrence of such a conflict, by inducing the Porte, if it desired to stand well with the civilized world, and specifically with this country—if it desired still to retain the benefits assured to Turkey by the blood and treasure of her allies so lavishly spent in the Crimean War, and by the subsequent guarantees of the Treaties of 1856—no longer to confine itself to illusive promises of administrative reform, but to set itself steadily, earnestly, and effectually to work, with a determination to relieve its subjects of all races from grievances which pressed equally on all; and more especially to watch over the Christian subjects of the Sultan, to secure them from a renewal of the injustice and persecution of which they had been the victims, and to protect them from wrong and violence, whether directed against them by the malevolence of their Mussulman fellow-subjects, or by oppression and exactions on the part of local Mussulman authorities. As regarded the course which, as shown in the Correspondence, Her Majesty's Government had generally pursued in these matters, he was not prepared to offer any unfriendly criticism; but he would rather express satisfaction at their having so pointedly, though in moderate and cautious terms, exposed the extravagant and obnoxious pretension under which certain Powers had assumed to themselves a right to lay down a policy in matters in regard to which other Powers had, under Treaty, a common interest with themselves, and had thereupon called on those other Powers to adopt and enforce the conclusion at which they had arrived. In the melancholy state of affairs now prevailing in European Turkey, any attempt on the part of Her Majesty's Government at the present moment to put an end to it would probably be worse than useless. Still, while employing their utmost influence at Constantinople to induce the Porte to prevent or suppress any general outbreak of fanaticism on the part of the Mussulmans, which might aggravate the calamities of the Christian subjects of the Sultan, Her Majesty's Government might well declare, in the most distinct terms, their desire and readiness, whenever a suitable opportunity offered itself, to exert their good offices in order to promote a return of peace and to heal the injuries of that most calamitous and destructive warfare, so that hereafter relations of good neighbourhood might prevail between the Christian and Mussulman subjects of the Sultan. Endeavours made at this moment prematurely and ostentatiously to effect a reconciliation between contending interests would, in all probability, only add fuel to the existing flame of insurrection. The time might, however, come, and, indeed, was probably not far distant, when the insurgent Provinces might moderate their demands, and when Her Majesty's Government might thereupon feel themselves warranted in recommending the Porte to accede to them.

LORD WAVENEY said, he was inclined to think that the character of the present struggle in Turkey was not yet quite appreciated. It did not appear to be a conflict between ordinary belligerents, but was rather the culminating point of an antagonism of races which had been accumulating for ages. He dissented from the opinion that that movement had been precipitated from without. If there was anything more clearly shown than another by the Papers before them it was that that was an internal conflict. A great responsibility was coming upon us. If the Turkish Government had been unable to put down the isolated efforts of a small handful of insurgents, what was the prospect before it when two military masses, at all events, were in action against it? The Turkish Government had not now to deal, as it had a few years ago, with the goat-herds of the Morea or the traders of the Archipelago, but with mountain races trained to mountain warfare, and, more than that, with one organized community, one Principality, which had shown that it possessed within itself elements of progress, and which had held its people in hand under great exasperation. When it was asked what should be done in the event of intervention by another Power occurring in that contest, his answer was that the Power that had proved equal to influence the other Power—the Power which had its iron-clad fleet in Besika Bay was perfectly able to deal with that question. England was, for the moment, mistress of the situation. She had shown no uncertain policy; and he trusted that when the confusion of events brought up new phases of action, whoever wielded English power would not hesitate to act in a large spirit and in the interests of freedom. Without reference to Andrassy Notes or Berlin Memorandums, let the Ambassadors of the Great Powers be invited to participate in the conclusions at which a Conference might arrive; and with them there should be united the Representatives of the maritime States of Europe, which, although they had not yet been named in debate, had no less interest in the settlement of that question than those Great Powers themselves.

Lord CAMPBELL: I regret to be obliged to ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes; but it was not to be supposed that a question of this kind could be immediately disposed of. And, first, let me return my thanks to the noble Lord the former Under Secretary at the Foreign Office, and the noble Lord who has just retired from the House, for the qualified support which they have given to the Motion. The noble Earl the former Secretary of State (Earl Granville) said that it dissatisfied him, but did not proceed to specify a single point on which he could object to it. When the noble Earl is dissatisfied with any Resolution, and yet is utterly unable to impugn it, or overthrow the grounds on which it stands, it clearly has a good deal to recommend it. If the noble Earl thought the terms of the Resolution badly chosen, while its sense was just, why could he not have offered an Amendment, which, had it been consistent with the general idea, I should not have resisted when it came from such a quarter. The noble Earl entered into a long defence of the proceedings in 1871 for the revision of the Treaty of March 30, 1856. And as they had scarcely been alluded to to-night, he certainly betrayed an uneasy conscience in defending them. I now come to the noble Earl the Secretary of State, who told the House in reference to what had fallen from me, that he had heard an after-dinner speech in favour of his health, when he desired to hear a criticizm of his policy. My Lords, I never listened to a phrase in either House of Parliament more thoroughly devoid of generosity and delicacy. Is anyone to be the object of derisive taunts, because he has not dwelt on the errors of the noble Earl, when a question wholly separate and different, when a question much more practical and grave, was brought before your Lordships? The question before the House was and is, whether or not to adopt a Resolution tending to the repose of Europe and the maintenance of Treaties? And the noble Earl complains because in restricting myself to this high and important ground, I have not touched on the reproaches to which the Government are open. What degree of accusation does he call for? Supposing I admitted that for the union of the three Powers in October, 1874, the inertness of the Foreign Office is exclusively responsible, would he be satisfied? Supposing I admitted—as I did last Session—that the loss of Austria as an ally may be attributed to his proceedings, would he be contented? Supposing I went further, and remarked that he ought not to have participated in the mission of the Consuls to Mostar, and thus encouraged the insurgents, would he acquit me? If I advanced another step, and urged that he ought never to have subscribed to the Andrassy Note, whose consequences are now before the world, should I respond to that appetite for criticizm which it appears that in my former speech I left unsatisfied this evening? Or must I go so far as to maintain that, while he holds his present office, there is very little chance, in my opinion, that the balance of the world will be restored, or the reforms essential to the cause of Ottoman integrity established? I shall if he requires it. My Lords, in asking and expecting me to withdraw the Resolution, the noble Earl has shown but little penetration when, to speak against it, he was driven to the frivolous and feeble pretext that it contained expressions of defiance, a view which nobody who read its terms could possibly accede to. It was not lightly framed, it has not been precipitately offered. To withdraw it would not be consistent with the duty which I owe to others out-of-doors, or to myself, or to your Lordships. The Government must either negative, accept, or move the Previous Question on it. If you negative it, you proclaim to the world that you are hostile to the European races of the Porte, and to the Treaties which enable you to come forward on the subject. If you move the Previous Question, you place the House of Lords in an ambiguous and not a satisfactory position. Whatever course is taken, the noble Earl will have no more success in urging me to withdraw the Resolution than he has had as yet in urging the three Powers to withdraw from one another.

And, a question being stated thereupon, the previous question was put—"Whether the said Question shall be now put?"

Resolved in the *negative*.

House adjourned at half-past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow half-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 31*st July*, 1876.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Queen Anne's Bounty * [278]; Clean Rivers* [279].

Second Reading—Tralee Savings Bank * [275]; Forfeiture Relief * [259].

Committee—Report—Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bingley, &c.)* [255]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Chelmsford, &c.) * [256]; Police (Expenses) Act Continuance * [268].

Considered as amended—Bishopric of Truro * [185].

Third Reading — Saint Vincent, Tobago, and Grenada Constitution * [253], and *passed*.

Withdrawn — University of Oxford * [146]; University of Cambridge * [151]; Roads and Bridges (Scotland) * [118].

POST OFFICE—TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION IN CORNWALL.—QUESTION.

Mr. YOUNG asked the Postmaster General, If he has received a letter signed by the Harbour Master of Porthleven in Cornwall, on the subject of telegraph communication to that place; and, whether he has considered the facts stated in that letter; and if under the circumstances he sees his way to join Porthleven by telegraph to Helston at an early date?

Lord JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, he had received such a letter, but under existing circumstances he was not prepared to take any steps in the matter.

CRIMINAL LAW—PONTEFRACT MAGISTRATES—CASE OF DUGGAN.

QUESTION.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been called to a case, reported in the Leeds newspapers of the 21st and 22nd days of July, whereby it would appear that an old man named Duggan had been committed by two justices of the borough of Pontefract to Wakefield Prison for fourteen days for being drunk in the streets; that the old man, when before the magistrates, complained of acute suffering from disease, and prayed to be allowed to see a medical man; that this prayer was refused on the ground that he would see one when he got to Wakefield; and that the old man, so denied medical aid, dropped dead in the streets whilst in charge of the constable who was conducting him to prison; and, whether, if the statements in the Leeds newspapers to the above effect be substantially correct, he has taken or intends to take any and what steps to mark the sense of Her Majesty's Government of the conduct of the magistrates in the case?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he knew nothing whatever of the case, except through information which he had received in a letter from the magistrates. The letter stated that one morning this man complained of illness, and instead of being brought before the magistrates on that day, he set off, and was accompanied by a policeman a greater part of the way, to the residence of the medical officer of the Union, in order that he might obtain aid there. An order of admission to the Union was given to him, and at 4 o'clock the same day he was found helplessly intoxicated. He was then taken up a second time, and on the following day was charged with being drunk. He had complained of bronchitis, and said if the justices would let him go, he would not get drunk again, and would go into the workhouse. He also had said he would like to see a doctor. But, without any explanation or excuse, he had not availed himself of the Union order in his possession, and the justices came to the conclusion that he could not be so ill as he had represented himself to be. Nor did he say that he was suffering from heart disease, and he was not, as alleged, in a sinking condition when he left the Court. The newspaper report was perfectly untrue, where it stated that the justices had said he would see a medical man when he got to Wakefield. The justices never made such a suggestion. After conviction, in order that he might go to Wakefield as soon as possible, they sent a policeman at a much earlier period than was absolutely necessary. It turned out that he died of heart disease, and the justices had not the slightest knowledge that he was suffering from that disease. He (Mr. Cross) did not intend to take any steps in the matter.

CRIMINAL LAW — CASES OF LEWIS, PLATT, AND LANCASTER—REMISSION OF SENTENCE.—QUESTON.

Dr. **KENEALY** asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has received a Petition from Hanley Potteries, signed by Clergymen and Ministers of all religious denominations, and the inhabitants generally, praying for the remission of a sentence passed on three boys named Lewis, Platt, and Lancaster, two of them being nine years old and the other ten, by which they are to be detained in an Industrial School until they are sixteen years old; and, if so, whether he intends to take any steps in the matter so as to alter or amend the sentence?

Mr. **ASSHETON CROSS**, in reply, said, he had only that day received an explanation from the magistrates, and there seemed to be a difference of opinion on the subject. A second application had been made, and he would not be in a position to come to a final conclusion for two or three days.

NAVY—CORONERS IN NAVAL DISTRICTS.—QUESTION.

Sir **WILLIAM HARCOURT** asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will consider the expediency of laying down the rule that a person appointed to the office of coroner in districts which include the great Naval Ports of the Country, shall not at the same time hold employment under the Admiralty?

Mr. **HUNT**, in reply, said, the matter was engaging his attention.

ENGLAND AND FRANCE—EXTRADITION—CASE OF NADAL.

QUESTION.

Mr. **J. COWEN** asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been called to the case of Jean Nadal, who was directed to be acquitted at the last session of the Central Criminal Court, by the Right honourable Russell Gurney, on the plea of jurisdiction raised by his counsel; and, whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to take any steps with a view to amend the unsatisfactory state of the Law of Extradition with France?

Mr. **ASSHETON CROSS**, in reply, said, he was informed by the Clerk of the Arraigns at the Central Criminal Court that the defendant was taken into custody in England for larceny, but it was found that if any offence had been committed at all it was committed in France. Therefore it was a question of jurisdiction, and not of extradition. The terms of a new Treaty with France had been arranged, and he hoped the Treaty itself would very shortly be signed.

FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES — REPORTED COMMERCIAL TREATY.

QUESTION.

Mr. **ANDERSON** asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If it be the fact that a commercial treaty has just been concluded between France and America, under which America agrees to reduce the Import Duties on French productions and manufactures; and, whether this treaty will put France on a more favourable footing in American trade than this Country, and if he can do nothing by negotiation to induce America to reduce some of the Duties on British manufactures which are at present practically prohibitory?

Mr. **BOURKE**, in reply, said, the Government were aware that reports had been in circulation respecting such a Treaty, but they had received no information in regard to it, and did not think it probable that such a Treaty would be entered into, for it was not at all likely the American Government would reduce their tariff duties at present.

CHINA — THE YUNNAN MISSION— THE REPORT.—QUESTION.

MR. MARK STEWART asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affair, If he can inform the House when the Papers containing the Report of Mr. Grosvenor's Mission to Yunnan will be laid upon the Table?

MR. BOURKE, in reply, said, that the Report had not yet been received, and therefore it was impossible to say when it would be laid upon the Table.

BRITISH HONDURAS.—QUESTION.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the attention of the Colonial Office has been called to a Petition complaining of misgovernment, presented by the Inhabitants of British Honduras to the Legislative Council, and refused by the Lieutenant Governor, Major Mundy, on the alleged ground that the language was not sufficiently respectful; and, whether the grievances complained of were not numerous, and of a serious nature?

MR. J. LOWTHER: Sir, the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been drawn to the matter, and I am bound to say that, having read it, in my opinion, the language of the Petition hardly appears to be such as need have precluded its reception by the Lieutenant Governor, who, it is only right I should add, acted under the advice of his Council in the course he adopted. After considering the grievances alleged, the Secretary of State does not think that any extensive alterations of the existing fiscal system are practicable; but the whole question of the finance of the colony in question will continue to receive our careful attention.

INDIA—WAR OFFICE CHARGES.

QUESTION.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If, in regard to the conflicting character of the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee, he will furnish the House with a statement of the advances on account of War Office Charges made by the India Office to the Exchequer since the abolition of the agreement about the Capitation Rates for Effective and Non-effective Services, stating the dates on which the advances were made by the India Office, dates brought to account as national receipts, and years and quarters in which included in the accounts of the income of the Kingdom; and of any interval between these, the causes and objects of the delays; also the amounts appropriated out of the Indian advances in each quarter and year to clear off the War Office claims, and the yearly balances and totals not cleared off, and, if these balances were retained in the Exchequer as income, then to what extent the income of the Kingdom has been unduly swelled in each of the past years?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he was not prepared at present to furnish the House with a statement of the nature desired by the Question of the hon. and gallant Member. It was rather a complicated matter, and it would be more conveniently dealt with in the Report of the Auditor General than by him (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) in answer to a Question.

WEST COAST OF AFRICA—THE ACTING ADMINISTRATOR OF THE GAMBIA.

QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN M'ARTHUR asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, If his attention has been called to a correspondence between Captain Cooper the Acting Administrator of the Gambia and Mr. Quin a merchant at Bathurst; and, whether, considering the tone and character of such correspondence, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to take any steps in relation to the conduct of Captain Cooper?

MR. J. LOWTHER, in reply, said, his attention had been called to the correspondence referred to. His noble Friend the Secretary of State had intimated to the Acting Administrator that, in his opinion, the tone adopted in the communication in question was unusual and undesirable in official communications. Captain Cooper being a most efficient officer, it was not intended to take any further notice of the matter.

INDIA—INDIAN FINANCE—THE EXCHANGES.—QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether, considering that when the Indian Budget was introduced in Calcutta in March last, the loss to India by exchange on transactions with London was estimated at £2,332,000 for the current year, and that there has since been a considerable further fall in the rate of exchange, he is able to inform the House at what amount the loss to India is now estimated; and, further, to inquire whether he can state the aggregate amount which has been spent by the Government on State Railways in India up to the present time?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, the two parts of the Question of the hon. Gentleman refer to two very important items of Indian expenditure. Upon both these subjects I shall be ready to give full explanation and information upon the annual Indian Financial Statement. I must ask the hon. Gentleman, therefore, to allow me to postpone any statement until that date, when I shall be able not only to give figures, but also the explanations necessary to make the figures intelligible.

CHINA—CHINESE CONSUL AT HONG KONG.—QUESTION.

MR. RICHARD asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any steps have been taken to give effect to the proposal made by Her Majesty's Minister at Pekin, that a Chinese Consul should be appointed to reside at Hong Kong, and which was approved by Lord Carnarvon as

> "only the recognition of a reciprocal right which China is entitled to claim in common with all other Powers whose subjects resort to the Colony, if International Law and the usage of civilized States are to be applied in our relations with that country?"

MR. J. LOWTHER, in reply, said, that no decided step had been taken in the matter, as the Government were considering whether the desired end might not be attained in another manner more in harmony with the wishes of the Legislature of Hong Kong than by appointing a Chinese Consul there.

WEST COAST OF AFRICA—DISPUTES WITH DAHOMEY.—QUESTION.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, If it is true, as stated in the "Daily News" of 28th July (by Eastern Telegraph), that a British force is about to land, or has already landed, at Ecoportonova, on the West Coast of Africa, with the intention of proceeding up the country to attack the capital of Dahomey?

MR. J. LOWTHER, in reply, said, that no information had reached the Government leading them to believe that any attack on the capital of the King of Dahomey was contemplated, neither had they authorized any such proceeding.

MERCANTILE MARINE—LIFE-SAVING APPARATUS.—QUESTION.

COLONEL BERESFORD asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether the attention of the Government has been directed to the experiments on various life-saving apparatus which took place off Dover on Thursday, 20th instant; and, whether it is the intention of the Government in any way to assist Mr. G. F. Parrott in the further trials he proposes to make with similar apparatus during the summer and autumn?

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY, in reply, said, that he understood that certain experiments had been made off Dover last Saturday of the kind referred to, but he did not know with what result, beyond that which appeared in the papers. There was no fund at the disposal of the Board of Trade to encourage inventors, and even if there was one there were so many inventors that it would be unadvisable for the Board of Trade to show any favour towards any particular one, or in any way to express their judgment upon the comparative merits of the various methods.

ARMY (INDIA)—SERVICE OF EUROPEAN REGIMENTS.—QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is true that he has proposed to reduce the service of European regiments in India to half the present term; and, if so, whether regard will be had to the military and financial necessities of India before any such plan is adopted, and full opportunity will be given to the Indian authorities to express their opinion on it?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: No, Sir; no such proposal has been made, nor would it be made without consultation with the Indian authorities.

SWEDEN—THE BRITISH CHURCH AT STOCKHOLM.—QUESTION.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that, although the Committee of the British Church at Stockholm had been successful in its civil suit against the intruding body, yet on the second or criminal suit it had been condemned in a heavy and to those persons ruinous fine of 2,000 dollars, besides costs to be paid within fifteen days; and, whether he can state the steps which Her Majesty's Government propose to take in behalf of those unfortunate persons?

MR. BOURKE, in reply, said, that he was not in possession of sufficient information to enable him to give an absolutely final answer to his hon. Friend. At present he would say that the dispute at Stockholm appeared to have arisen between two sets of British subjects, and it seemed to have been decided by competent tribunals. Under these circumstances, it appeared to Her Majesty's Government that they had no *locus standi* for interference.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE: Can the hon. Gentleman explain the apparently divergent decisions of the two tribunals?

MR. BOURKE: The only explanation I can give is that we have heard nothing at all about the first. The only information we have is as to the second.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE: I beg to give Notice that I shall repeat the Question.

TURKEY AND GREECE — PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF CIRCASSIANS.

QUESTION.

MR. W. E. FORSTER asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government has received any information relating to an intention on the part of the Turkish Government to settle Circassians in the provinces in the neighbourhood of Greece, or to a protest by the Greek Minister at Constantinople against such intention? He should not have troubled the right hon. Gentleman on the subject had he not heard the rumour from quarters which led him to believe there might be some foundation in truth for it.

MR. DISRAELI: I heard, on Saturday, from Mr. Wyndham, Her Majesty's *Chargé d'Affaires* at Athens, that the Greek Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had informed him that he had received an answer to his inquiry from the Turkish Government, who stated that there was no foundation whatever for that statement. Within a few minutes I have received a telegram from Sir Henry Elliot, who says he has conferred with the Grand Vizier, who told him that it was entirely without foundation.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

QUESTIONS. OBSERVATIONS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina."

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I understood, Sir, that it was the intention of the right hon. Gentleman to make some statement in regard to the position of Public Business, and I believe it was the general expectation on this side of the House that the statement would have been made on this Motion. I trust, however, that the right hon. Gentleman does intend before we proceed with the debate on Turkish affairs to make some statement respecting the intentions of the Government in the matter.

MR. DISRAELI: I think, Sir, the best statement I can make is to tell the House the order of Business that I contemplate for the present week. To-night we proceed with the discussion on Turkish affairs. To-morrow we propose to take the English, Irish, and Scotch Education Estimates. Wednesday is reserved for the Bill of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. R. Smyth). On Thursday we take the Report of the Education Bill. On Friday we shall proceed with the remaining Votes of Supply, which will permit of discussion with respect to the affairs of Egypt and the Suez Canal, and the mission of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Cave); and on Saturday I hope we shall take the third reading of the Education Bill. The House will understand that this arrangement of Business demands on the part of the Government a considerable sacrifice of their other measures. The Prisons Bill is a Bill which I, for one, and I believe a majority of the House, approve. I think it an excellent Bill, and the country will have an opportunity of considering its merits during the Recess. It will, however, take some time to pass, and in the present state of Public Business we cannot hope successfully to proceed with it; but my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department wishes to commit the Bill *pro formâ*, in order that he may introduce into it Amendments of which he has given Notice, so that the Bill may be re-printed, and be in a perfect state, so far as our view of the question is concerned, for future discussion. I am sorry to say also that it will not be possible to proceed with the University Bills, but I trust that they may be proceeded with next Session. If this plan is adopted, I should hope that we might on Monday conclude Supply and pass the Appellate Bill through the stage for which it now stands. I do not know that there is any other announcement that I need make to the House; but if hon. Members should support the Government in these views, I think the Session may end at a period not much more remote than usual.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER wished to know what course the Government were prepared to take in reference to the Cruelty to Animals Bill?

Mr. DISRAELI: I am not prepared to give up the chance of passing it.

Mr. E. J. REED asked when the Lords' Amendments to the Merchant Shipping Bill would be taken?

Mr. DISRAELI: That, of course, is in the Order of Business. We have to consider the Amendments of the Lords; I cannot exactly fix the day on which we may do so, but the House cannot be prorogued without the Bill being passed.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA asked a question as to the Irish Court of Judicature Bill.

Mr. DISRAELI: On Thursday night I shall be better able to answer the question.

Mr. FAWCETT said, that the right hon. Gentleman had made no allusion whatever to what he must admit to be a question of great importance. He had not even condescended to say whether the Indian Budget would be brought forward at all. As to the University Bills, if a time could be named for disposing of the Orders, he believed certain suggestions might be made which would facilitate legislation next Session.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to put one or two other questions to him, so as to save him the trouble of rising again. The arrangements of the right hon. Gentleman appear to depend upon the assumption that the Turkish debate will terminate this evening. I should be very glad if it were in my power to give any assistance towards the accomplishment of that assumption; but I fear from the information which reaches me it is extremely improbable that it will be possible it should terminate this evening. I would therefore ask the right hon. Gentleman what arrangements he thinks it would be in his power to make, supposing, which is, at all events, possible, that the debate cannot finish to-night. The right hon. Gentleman did not mention any day for the debate on Extradition Treaties, a subject which I understand my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) is to have an opportunity of bringing forward. I should like to ask whether it is in the right hon. Gentleman's power to state on what day, according to present arrangements, the Extradition debate will be brought on, and on what day, if necessary, the debate of this evening will be resumed.

Mr. RAMSAY wished to know whether the Government intended to proceed with the Sheriffs Courts (Scotland) Bill, and the Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill?

Mr. DISRAELI: Sir, with respect to the remarks of the hon. Member for Hackney, I would observe that I did not intend to give a complete programme of the progress of the remaining Business of the Session, but only to fulfil my promise to state the Business of the week, and at the same time to give the House the names of the more important measures which the Government had determined to withdraw from their notice. It is, therefore, as open to the House as it is to the Government to form an opinion as to what may be the progress of the other Business of the House. It is certainly impossible to bring forward the Indian Budget this week, and consequently I did not announce the day on which it might be taken. But I should think no one except the hon. Member for Hackney could for a moment have supposed that Her Majesty's Government would advise the Prorogation of Parliament without giving the House an opportunity of discussing the financial affairs of India. With regard to the inquiry just made by the noble Lord, I have to make the same remark as to the promise I made to give an opportunity for discussing the question of Extradition. It cannot be discussed this week, and therefore I did not give notice of the day on which it might be brought forward. By the statement I have made as to other measures, however, I have enabled the House to form a fair estimate as to the period when the hon. and learned Member for Oxford may have an opportunity of raising the question of Extradition. With regard to the first of the Scotch Bills referred to by the hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay) I understand there is a prospect of passing it without opposition, and therefore I do not wish to withdraw a Bill under those circumstances. With respect to the second Bill he mentioned, I believe it has been already announced that the Government do not intend to proceed with it this Session. There then remains the question of the noble Lord, as to what will become of the debate of this evening if it should be adjourned. I do not wish to contemplate that the debate will be adjourned this evening. I think it might be discussed and concluded tonight by sitting to a rather unusual hour. If, however, it should be the wish of the House to adjourn the debate I shall be unable to name an immediate day for its consideration, because we have Business with which we propose to proceed arranged for every day in the present week. Supply and the Education Bill must be proceeded with without loss of time unless the Prorogation should be delayed much later than it would otherwise be. I am unable, therefore, to state what day the adjourned debate—if it should be adjourned—can be resumed, but I will take care that a day is secured for that purpose.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE inquired what Estimates would be taken on Friday?

MR. DISRAELI: I proposed to proceed with Supply to-morrow.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: But Friday.

MR. DISRAELI: The Suez Canal.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he presumed the Supplementary Estimates delivered that morning would also be proceeded with on Friday.

MR. DISRAELI: Yes, and Monday.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in answer to the question put by the hon. Member for Hackney, stated that he should propose to discharge the Orders of the Day on the University Bills when the Orders were called on.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: There will be a Morning Sitting to-morrow?

MR. DISRAELI: Yes.

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

TURKEY — THE INSURRECTION IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA.

RESOLUTION.

MR. BRUCE, in rising to call the attention of the House to the Papers relating to the Insurrection in Bosnia and the Herzegovina; and to move—

> "That this House is of opinion that Her Majesty's Government, while maintaining the respect due to existing Treaties, should exercise all their influence with the view of securing the common welfare and equal treatment of the various races and religions which are under the authority of the Sublime Porte,"

said, that he wished first to make a brief explanation on the subject of the alteration made in the terms of his Motion. He had placed that Motion on the Paper without the least intention of making it a Party question; but he was afterwards informed that some hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite had taken that view of his Resolution, and as he was unwilling that it should bear this complexion, he had altered the terms of his Motion. He believed that the noble Lord the Member for Calne (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice) had made a similar alteration in the terms of his Amendment. With regard to the Motion itself, he felt a certain diffidence in bringing it forward, not only in consequence of the magnitude and importance of the question itself, but because the debate was of a somewhat different character from those usually raised in that House. In discussing questions affecting the policy of this country, hon. Members spoke to an audience of their own countrymen, who knew them and their position, and were very good critics and judges of the importance to be attached to their remarks. But hon. Members who might take part in that debate were speaking to a much larger audience. Their remarks would be read at Belgrade, in Constantinople, and in other countries where they were personally unknown, and where their words would be regarded not in the measure of the individual importance of the speaker, but as having been spoken in an Assembly consisting of the Representatives of the greatest Power in the world. It was desirable, therefore, that those who took part in that discussion should express themselves with moderation, and avoid any occasion or intrusion of their Party differences. For himself, he could honestly state his intention of so acting. Before discussing the Papers he wished to say a few words upon the general condition of this Turkish question. The Eastern Question had been very much talked and written about; but many mistaken ideas were current as to the policy which this country had pursued upon that question for many years past. There was a certain political interest for England in the unrivalled position of Constantinople itself; in its harbour, which was absolutely impregnable if held by a strong Power, particularly if that Power were backed by the possession of the shores of the Black Sea. The possession of Constantinople under these circumstances would constitute a formidable menace in the Eastern part of the Mediterranean, and might materially affect our position in reference to our route to India, particularly if the Power to which he referred had possessions or objects contrary to our own in Asia Minor. Of course, we might secure ourselves by seizing Candia and Egypt, but such a course of proceeding would simply be increasing our responsibilities, and raising complications which no statesman in this country would willingly adopt, besides involving us in a conflict which it would be desirable to avoid. A Power already possessing the shores of the Black Sea, and thereby able to command the trade of the Danube would, if it also possessed Constantinople, introduce a disturbing element into our trade, especially if that Power were not characterized by the liberality in commercial matters which Turkey, to do her justice, had always shown. The policy of this country, and the interest felt by our great statesmen in Turkey had been influenced by these considerations. But we had never been the advocates of Turkey regarded as a Mussulman Power, we had simply felt that as long as these countries remained in the hands of a comparatively insignificant Power the danger of political disturbance was greatly lessened. While saying that, however, at the same time, he was sure that neither this nation, nor any Government worthy of representing this nation, would not allow the political advantages which might be obtained by the position of Turkey to stand in the way, if it were necessary they should be purchased by the misery and misgovernment of the people. The great object of our policy was that while maintaining the *status quo* we were ready to use our influence in obtaining necessary reforms, in purifying the Turkish Administration, and in equalizing the position of the different races which were under the same sway. Whatever might have been the partial success or future of these efforts, the main object of the English Government had never wavered, and the happiness and good government of the races under Turkish sway had always been the desire and wish of the statesmen of this country, and he hoped would always continue to remain so. The state of things in Turkey was in many respects much to be deplored, and we had the Eastern question with its old difficulties staring us in the face, as it did many years ago. The condition of Turkey was mainly owing to the complication of races and religions and the extreme misgovernment of the Central Power. Those religions were intermixed in all parts of the Empire, and there had never been a proper recognition of their positions and claims. He did not refer to the position of the Churches, which was not to be much complained of. The Christian communities had their own Ministers and managed their own affairs, and they were not subject to the interference of the Central Power with the exception of its consent being required to the appointment of the principal ecclesiastics. Complaints were made that they were not allowed to use bells in some rural districts, but elsewhere, and especially in Constantinople, bells were used to such an extent as would cause the interference of the police magistrate in any other country in the world. The evidence before the House as to the condition of the Christian communities did not show any great degree of oppression, and on this branch of the subject he would repeat a statement made by Fuad Pasha to a deputation which waited upon him representing a particular sect, and which the Pasha repeated to him (Mr. Bruce)—

> "The Mussulmans are bound by their religion to give the utmost respect to anything which is placed as a deposit in their hands. They are bound to retain it intact, and to restore it without injury. We look upon the Christian communities under our Government as being placed by Providence with us as a deposit. We must keep them intact and respect them. We do not, like you Christians, think that we have a right to alter their condition as we think proper."

Now, up to the present the Christians had been comparatively unmolested in their corporate capacity; but he was afraid that those who knew Turkey best would unite in saying that, with the exception of some very small communities, there was not amongst them very much of the intelligence shown amongst Christian communities in this part of the world, and so far there had not been any indication amongst them that their religion had placed them on a superior level to that of the Mahomedans. There was not a very great difference between the state of the Christian peasant and the Mahomedan peasant, except with respect to what he might call the social position of the Christians as individuals. For many years, for instance, their testimony was not received as against that of the Mussulmans. That grievance in a great degree had now been removed wherever the Government was strong, but it still remained in force in many parts of the Empire. Then there was the question of Christians being admitted to military service, but the evidence on that subject went to show that was a privilege which they did not wish to possess. It was true they paid a tax in lieu of service, but he believed that if they were asked they would rather pay than serve; and, indeed, in one of Sir Henry Elliot's despatches he mentioned that the influence of Earl Russell and of Lord Dalling was exercised against the granting of that privilege. That, therefore, could not be considered a very great boon. In other respects the Christian was very much in the same position as the Mahomedan, and that was bad enough. They were subject to all the evils of the Turkish Government—its arbitrariness, its exactions, its monstrous system of taxation, and there could be no doubt that in those respects much required to be done to better their condition. But whatever should be done for the one, ought equally to be done for the other. The greatest grievance of all—that which was most frequently mentioned in the Papers before the House—was that which related to the system of taxation, resolving itself, as it did, into a system of tithes. The House was aware that under the system of capitulations a great proportion of the wealthy inhabitants did not pay any direct taxation at all, and the taxes fell almost exclusively upon the agricultural population, both Mussulman and Christian. The question of commuting the taxes and collecting them directly had more than once been raised, but the peasantry objected to it, and it had to be given up, and the system of farming the taxes was still maintained. It was, indeed, questionable whether direct collection by the Government would be more favourable to the people than the system of farming now was. One thing should not be forgotten, for it was, he believed, a matter of considerable importance—namely, that as long as the country was quiet the different races lived together in comparatively tolerable harmony; but, unfortunately, the question of religion had been mixed up with that of foreign protection, and the Christian population was supposed to be more or less—on account of their religion, that of the Greek Church—under the power and influence of Russia. The result was that whenever the Turkish Power was attacked, there was a strong tendency to blame the Christians for what they were supposed to be privy to, and a great part of the danger to which the Christians were exposed was traceable to the fact that they were regarded as being in alliance with the enemies of Turkey. That was a matter which ought to be taken into account in calmly considering the whole state of the question. The difficulty was not attributable in any great degree to differences of race —races being so inextricably mixed up. The distinction of race did not co-exist with the distinction of religious belief. In many of the Provinces the dominant Turkish race had been merged in the Christian population, and that was the difficulty which existed in respect of that question of autonomy. It would be impossible to bring about an amalgamation of the two races, as was forcibly pointed out by Lord Derby in his despatch of the 27th of June last, and his (Mr. Bruce's) own opinion was, that in existing circumstances, no good would result from giving autonomy to the disaffected Provinces unless they were to be kept in order by some superior force. The position of the other semi-independent States had always been different from that of Bosnia and Herzegovina. There never were large numbers of Armenians in Roumania, and there were none in Montenegro; so that the establishment of autonomy in those Provinces was comparatively easy, and it had been more or less successful. The Servians had a very fertile country, and had always been disposed to peaceful pursuits; but the Montenegrins had no such advantages, and were generally distinguished by a fondness for joining in disturbances in whatever direction their sympathies for the time being might lead them. On the general question he could not help thinking that it was a very doubtful policy to go on multiplying these small States, which in all parts of Europe had been a source of great difficulty. Most of the great wars that had disturbed the Continent during the present century had had reference to the absorption or occupation of small States. Such a policy would tend rather to disturbance than to peace. There was no doubt that Servia and Montenegro had been to a certain extent dependent upon Russia, and had acted through the impulsion of Russian public opinion, if not of the Russian Government itself. In point of fact, they had done that which the Russian Government would not take the responsibility of doing for itself. Several solutions of the difficulty had been suggested. One was, and it enjoyed the merit of being both simple and complete in its operation, that the Mussulmans should be turned out of Europe altogether. It was Mr. Fox, he believed, who said that Mussulmans were an anachronism in Europe. That was quite true, but there were several other anachronisms existing in Europe which could not be dealt with in so sweeping a manner, and the proposal was not one that was likely to be received with favour in this 19th century. It was not in itself an advanced system of policy, and it had this further disadvantage, that it was quite clear that such a suggestion could not be acted upon; and it was equally clear that a policy of the kind could not possibly be carried out except at the cost of an immense amount of bloodshed. Granted there were large Mussulman populations in Europe, there were equally large Christian communities in Asia, and if the Mussulmans were driven out of Europe, their fanaticism would rise to such a height that reprisals would be adopted against the Christians in Asia, compared with which the recent atrocities in Bulgaria would be mere trifles. The people of Bosnia and Herzegovina were in a peculiar position, because most of the land in those Provinces was owned by Mussulmans, and the soil, which was formerly held by the tenants under a sort of feudal tenure, was now let under a system by means of which each tenant handed to his landlord a part of the crop which his land produced. Now, it was obvious that a system of that kind must be liable to greater abuse than any other kind; and, as a matter of fact, the disturbances which had arisen were due much more to agrarianism than to religion; for in the first representations which were made for redress, the people put forward their position as farmers. The difficulty of the situation was complicated by the fact of many of the Christian population having in course of time become Mussulmans, and in addition to this, the Christians in Bosnia and Herzegovina were Slavs, and they were in constant communication with the Slav committees in Servia and Dalmatia, by whom they were strongly influenced in all their conduct. Furthermore, there was a geographical drawback to the position of these Provinces, in that they were cut off from the seaboard by a thin wedge of country belonging to a Power which had always shown itself adverse and obstructive in reference to commercial matters. The result was that the country, shut out from the sea, was surrounded or flanked by a network of Austrian custom-houses, and lay entirely at the mercy of the Austrian Government. Perhaps the best thing of all others to be done would be to hand over the Provinces to Austria, and so give them access, through Dalmatia, to the sea coast; but that was obviously impossible, and the question that remained was as to the course that was practicable to be taken under the circumstances. It was well known that for a long period these countries had been discontented, and that the immediate cause for the present outbreak was an attempt on the part of certain refugees, who had broken out into insurrection by reason of the taxes levied upon them, to compel the people to join their cause. This they did, after assassinating a number of Turks, and burning several villages. For some time after its outbreak the Turks regarded the affair as of no importance, and thought it would not be long in its duration; but their forces were few in the disturbed districts, and they did not make any impression on the enemy. Then, as the Turkish Force increased, the Insurgents, resting as they did on the one side on Montenegro, and on the other on Bosnia and Servia, were enabled to carry on the campaign during the winter, and when defeated to retire within these Provinces, and to come back and attack the Turkish Army when they found it convenient. Meantime the Turkish Army, not expecting a long campaign, were sent into the field in a very bad state; their commissariat was bad and their condition during the winter might be described in a well-known phrase as "horrible and heart-rending." Hostilities were carried on by both sides with the greatest barbarity. Atrocities, much to be regretted, were committed by the Insurgents in the earlier stages of the war, atrocities, some of which he would fain hope had been exaggerated. The consequence was, that when the opportunity arose, the Turks retaliated and committed atrocities in their turn. It was evident that a barbarous warfare, continued so long under those circumstances, was calculated to excite the feelings of the Turkish population to such an extent as to render the maintenance of peace extremely difficult, and in the war to make them likely to resort to the most violent and unscrupulous means to effect their object. But after due allowance was made for all this, it was to be borne in mind that the detailed accounts of cruelties published by both sides were utterly untrustworthy, for the Turkish bulletins were very much what bulletins were in most parts of the world, and the Insurgents were very remarkable for their imaginative powers. Indeed, they reminded him of a fact that came under his own notice at Athens during the Cretan Insurrection. Mr. Findlay took the trouble to sum up the accounts of the killed contained in a file of newspapers, and he found that during that small war, the Turks had lost 6,900,000 men, and the Greeks a smaller number. Now he knew that the Slavs, whatever their other merits, had never shown that magnificent power of imagination which was the gift of the Greek race, and to which we owed so much in our younger days. Still the Slavs followed their example to a great extent, and unfortunately those exaggerations produced two effects—they tended to the exasperation of the Turkish population, and they led the Servians, Montenegrins, and other sympathizers utterly to undervalue and despise the Turkish Forces. The result of these causes combined were very disastrous. Meantime, the Porte proposed to introduce certain reforms, admirable in themselves, if there was any certainty of their being carried into effect. That was the difficulty. At that time the Three Northern Powers met at Vienna and drew up what was known as the Andrassy Note. There were two objections to that Note, however. One was a general objection. He confessed Her Majesty's Government were required to justify themselves for in any way accepting the interference of these Three Powers in a matter of the kind. In his opinion, anything which affected the condition of Turkey was not a question for the Three Northern Powers alone, but one in which the rest of Europe ought to be considered. The harmony of these Powers might be a great security for the peace of the world; but it was a different thing to constitute themselves as a Court which, in a matter affecting the internal relations of another country, would impose their will by force. No doubt if they were united they could impose their will on any Power by force; but it did not appear to him that they had any more right than any of the other signataries of the Treaty of Paris to impose their will on the rest of the world with regard to the steps to be taken for the pacification of the Turkish Empire. Another objection to the Andrassy Note was that it stipulated for certain reforms for the Insurgent Provinces alone. He always thought, and did still think, that if an attempt was made to maintain those Provinces in peace, that attempt should be directed to general, and not to mere partial improvements—to reforms applicable to the whole Empire. It was obvious that if certain concessions were made because a Province was in a state of insurrection, other Provinces would be induced to get up insurrections, in order to effect the same object, and then there would be a process of division carried on by constant insurrection and slaughter and misery, under the pretence of satisfying the wants of these particular Provinces. He admitted that the Insurgents had a great deal to complain of. At that time the Turkish Government did not give evidence that it was willing to carry out its own proposed reforms. But the other Governments ought to have insisted upon their being carried out. There were two reasons stated by the Government for accepting the Note; one was that the Turkish Government had asked them to do it, and the other that if these conditions were accepted by the Turkish Government the Austrian and Russian Governments would prevent supplies from reaching the Insurgents, and thus the war would come to an end. But when an attempt was made to carry out the Andrassy Note, it entirely failed. Turkey refused to stop the war or grant any concessions until the Insurgents laid down their arms. On the other hand, the Insurgents complained that they had not sufficient security that the conditions of the Andrassy Note would be carried into effect, and the question rose whether the Insurgents or the Turkish Government were to begin. The latter said they could not begin, because they were obliged to concentrate their troops, and could not allow the people to return to their homes until they did so; the Insurgents said they could not place themselves at the mercy of the Turks, because they would not trust the Turkish promises. Thus, as neither party would take the initiative, no result followed; and as there was no stoppage put to the supply of arms and ammunition to the Insurgents, the Turkish Government naturally thought they had not been well treated, and the irritation in Turkey against foreign Governments went on increasing. Matters continued in this way until the month of May, when a rising occurred in Bulgaria—and here he must now call attention to Paper 492, a letter written by General Tchernaieff, giving his own reasons for joining the Servian Army. He described the preparations which were being made by Bulgaria. The movements, he said, were regulated by a fixed programme. The Bulgarian insurrection was part, he said, of a large plan, and though the manner in which it was attempted to be put down was much to be deplored, still there appeared considerable reasons why Turkey should have been alarmed at it. So much for this letter of General Tchernaieff. It was rather a remarkable circumstance that Russian officers who made their way to the revolted districts and espoused the Servian cause entered the service either as generals or as newspaper correspondents. They sometimes began as generals and ended as newspaper corrrespondents. At other times they commenced as newspaper correspondents and ended as generals. Another event happened which caused considerable sensation at the time—that was the Salonica outrage. The cause of it was described in these papers. A girl who arrived with her mother by train at the station, in proceeding to the Governor's house to make a declaration, was surrounded by Greeks. She was carried off by the police and her veil torn. Among those who carried her off was the brother of the American Consul. Those who knew the country must be aware that such an outrage on a veiled girl was likely to create a great sensation. It was very natural that the Mahomedan population should become irritated, and unfortunately that irritation was connected with the Consuls. No blame attached to the American Consul; he was absent at the time, but his brother had taken part in the proceeding, and when the mob assembled next day, the two Consuls thought they had the power of rescuing the girl if they chose to do so. She was sent to the American Consul's house, and then the outrage was committed. He could not regard that outrage as showing any extreme irritation on the part of the Moslems towards the Christians. The circumstances which had led to that outrage would have caused a similar outbreak at any time and in other places, and he thought too much importance had been assigned to it, both in the Berlin Note and in the communications of the Consuls with foreign Governments. There was a very elaborate inquiry, several persons were hanged, and officials degraded and punished; but there seemed to have been no investigation as to how the matter originated. This produced another result which had a remarkable effect. The Consuls immediately telegraphed to their respective fleets, and the English fleet was brought to Besika Bay. Then came the Berlin Note, and it was remarkable that in that document the whole onus of the insurrection was thrown upon the Turks. There was evidence that the Three Powers who agreed to that Note had through their subjects to a great extent supported the insurrection, and therefore the charge that the Turks had not put it down did not come very well from them. The English Government declined to accept the Berlin Note for reasons stated in these Papers; but the immediate effect of that refusal on Turkey was very remarkable. He had frequent communications from that country, and he understood the effect of their refusal was, that the bitterness of the hostility towards the Christians on the part of the Moslems sensibly decreased. The fact that the English Government did not accept that document, and that they indicated a desire that Turkey should have justice done her, did more that anything else to prevent such outrages as that of Salonica, which might have been only the beginning, and to calm the fear and irritation that existed at Constantinople. The rejection of the Berlin Note coincided with the arrival of the Fleet, and impressed the Turks with confidence that they would be treated with fair play. Then followed a most remarkable event—the change of Government in Turkey, a change of Government proceeding, for the first time for many years at least, on constitutional views. It was brought about by a class of men among whom above all others they might have expected that fanaticism would have predominated. But, on the contrary, they never showed any feeling of the kind. That was clearly shown in these Papers; and the private accounts he had received entirely coincided with this view. He had it from one who was in Constantinople at the time, that the Softas wished for good government for the whole country—for the Christians as well as themselves, and that their object was to get rid of the corrupt Minister who had brought their country to its present state of degradation. The success of the movement was a remarkable phenomenon and could not be neglected, and, if it was true that the new Government had not been able to carry out its programme, the explanation was to be found in circumstances which would have paralyzed any Government. Immediately after its accession, Servia declared war, and the war had naturally taxed the efforts of the Government. The English Government, we were assured, had preserved neutrality, and had done all they could to influence other Governments to do so, and that was our best policy. It was better for us and for humanity that this quarrel should be settled one way or another than that it should be kept open by underhand support, and that these wretched people should be exposed to the continuance of useless and purposeless hostilities, without any prospect of success. He trusted that Her Majesty's Government would feel called upon before long to endeavour to put a stop to the effusion of blood, and that they would then keep in view the policy of pressing reforms on the Porte, so as to restore harmony and prosperity to its subjects. That had been our policy in the past, and though it had not been so successful as we could wish, it had succeeded to a certain extent, and the Turks had done something in populous places where they had most influence and which were easy of access. After what had passed, as well as on account of Treaties, European Governments were entitled to demand something more than the bare promise of reforms, which he trusted would receive the support of the Mussulman population. He believed they felt the miseries which their own misgovernment had produced, and that reforms to benefit all classes would be received without opposition and without jealousy. If, however, we merely supported the Christians as against the Mussulmans, good results would not be produced. Among the Mussulman population there was now manifest a certain degree of political light, and they could no longer pretend ignorance upon the point, that their existence as a nation depended upon the conciliation of their fellow-subjects and the moral support of the nations of Western Europe. He hoped and trusted that Her Majesty's Government, knowing and feeling these things, would take a wide view of the subject, and would endeavour to carry out these objects, and he was sure that in so doing they would be supported by the approval of the English people. He would conclude by submitting the Resolution to the consideration of the House.

MR. HANBURY, in seconding the Motion, desired to direct attention to the real nature of the disturbances, for which, in his opinion, both Christian and Mussulman were to blame. He questioned the humanity, the tolerance, and the justice, and in our mouths the patriotism, of the proposal sometimes made to expel the Turk out of Europe; and, if the attempt was made, we must expect that a cry would be raised of "Asia for the Turks. Those who indulged in proposals of the kind did not know what Turkey was. Hon. Members talked of atrocities with special reference to Salonica. Now, those occurrences he neither desired, nor was he prepared to defend; they were gross and abominable; but we must, in common justice, recollect whom they began with, and that they were committed at a time when Mahomedans believed that the Christians of the world were in a conspiracy against them. They were provoked by what was undoubtedly a gross outrage on a Mahomedan woman; and Sir Henry Elliot had formerly warned us that Salonica had been for some time the only place in the Empire where any considerable persecution had been going on, and he attributed that entirely to the very great zeal of Christian missionaries there. The atrocities in Bulgaria were committed by men who not so many years ago were looked upon with as much compassion by Europe as they were now looked upon with aversion. The cruel wrongs the Circassians suffered at the hands of Russia justly appealed to the sympathy of Europe, and if now, when they had the opportunity, they retaliated, although that retaliation might be thoroughly unjustifiable, still there was no doubt whatever that these people had suffered grievous wrongs at the hands of a Christian people. And that was not only true of the past, but these outrages were not begun by Circassians, but, on the contrary, atrocities just as great as they committed were committed by the Christians of Bosnia, and there was not a pin to choose between the two. The Circassians were as unpopular with the Turks as with any other people, and two years ago, when he was in the south of Turkey, he saw some thousands, the last remnants of the settlers in Turkey, going back to serve in the Russian Army. When, too, there was a talk of expelling the Turks from Europe it must be remembered that the people of those provinces, Christian and Mahomedan alike, were all of the same Slavonic race and speaking the same language. When these people were spoken of as the most fanatical Mussulmans in the world it should be remembered that they were the descendants of people who had themselves suffered the cruellest religious persecutions recorded in history. It was said that these men ought to be kept in control by Turkey. He would not deny that; but he must, however, remind the House that the East was not like the West, and that there were other countries in the East of Europe besides Turkey in which the Governments and the people were at least 300 years behind the people of the West. It was also a most important fact that Turkey had about 20 different nationalities. Other nations found it difficult to govern more than one nationality, and Ireland was an example. In Turkey the difficulty, moreover, was aggravated by religious differences, and was mixed up with foreign intrigues. It was not to be supposed that we supported Turkey from any disinterested affection for that country. If, however, Turkey should disappear, what would happen to those 20 different nationalities? They might become distinct Powers, and would thus be so many stepping stones to Russian ambition. He, for one, was not prepared to see Russia by this means in such power in the Mediterranean or in the Persian Gulf as to stop our road to India; and if hon. Gentlemen said they did not care for India, he would reply that, in the next place, he was not prepared to see Russia stop the road to our

Colonies. If hon. Gentlemen said they did not care for our Colonies, he would ask them whether they were prepared to sacrifice the great trade of the Pacific, which would one day occupy so large a space in the future commerce of the world. Turkey was, at the present moment, the only Power to which we were prepared to trust the keys of Asia, and he, for one, was by no means willing to trust those keys to another Power, who would not only keep them for her own purpose, but might use them to break into the house. It was said, and a good deal had been heard about it, that the Turks were fanatics, but fanaticism was one of those misleading words that begged the question. In the sense in which we used it, it meant everything that was bad; but in the mouth of a Turk it meant devotion to his creed and country, and those were not virtues which Englishmen would wish to disparage. When a Turk was once roused, and believed that the other Powers were in a conspiracy against him, his blood was up, and from fanaticism, devotion, or patriotism—whatever it might be called—he would fight to the last. That, also, was a feeling that under similar circumstances would actuate a good many Englishmen. But Turkish fanaticism—when the Turk was left alone—took a far less active shape than in a good many countries in the West. He had travelled considerably in all the Turkish Provinces of Asia, where religious feelings were strongest. Yet he had been welcomed with a courtesy and hospitality which would have done credit to the most tolerant of Englishmen. If he passed from his own personal experiences to the Blue Book which he expected to be a record of religious persecution in Turkey, he found only four cases of alleged persecution, and these were but instances of converted Christians belonging to races which had never been free from the conscription, being obliged to join the Turkish Army. And with regard to them our Minister had expressed an opinion that there was no ground of complaint against the Turkish Government, and in no sense could they be regarded as cases of real religious persecution. The head of the Protestant community in Turkey declared that there was nothing in the nature of persecution of Christians by the authorities, although there was sectarian persecution by the more powerful Christian communities, and the inquiries showed that there had been good cause for such a declaration. The Greeks and Armenians formed the great majority of the Christian subjects of Turkey, and no complaints proceeded from them against the Turkish Government nor from the Roman Catholics, with very few exceptions. There was, however, a great deal to encourage persecution on the part of the Turks. The Christians were as disunited as possible, and while among the great mass of the Mahomedan population the virtues of sobriety, honesty, and regard for truth were almost universally practised, the Christian population of Turkey lamentably failed in these qualities. The truth was that this was not a question of religion, but of rich and poor. The poor Christians and poor Mahomedans lived in peace and unity together, but poor men were persecuted equally by rich Christians and rich Mahomedans. No better illustration of this could be found than what was going on in Bosnia at the present moment, where there would be found very little sympathy with the existing insurrection. He hoped that this would not be regarded as a religious question at all, and that it would not be supposed to be a religious crusade. It was a noteworthy fact that they had not heard of a single Christian from Asia joining in the insurrection. He had not seen a Bulgarian joining in the insurrection, although it might be said that he had been provoked by great atrocities. Neither had he seen the Roumanians taking part in the insurrection. The fact was the Servians and Montenegrins were rivals as to which should be the head of the great Slavonic Empire, upon which they had set their eyes; and, from a vulgar lust of territory, these people were beginning a war than which no gambler's coup was more immoral or unprovoked. Who, then, were going to follow them in this crusade? It was called an insurrection against oppression; but where were the oppressed? They were conspicuous by their absence. In truth the oppressed were now in Bosnia—driven over the border by men who, in the name of liberty, had burned their houses and forced them either into insurrection, or to leave their homes. Servia was practically independent. Montenegro was quite independent. The districts adjoining Herzegovina were also practically independent. And who were the oppressors? They were chiefly Socialists, Carlists, Garibaldians, and the refuse of all Europe — people who it was said wanted reform, but to whom reform would most stand in the way. Let him not be understood as saying, however, that a great deal of persecution did not go on in Bosnia; but who were the offenders? No doubt the Slav inhabitants had persecuted these people a great deal; but there were worse persecutors than the Slavs or the Mahomedan Beys. If the poor Christian and the poor Mahomedan were made to suffer, it was not so much by the hand of the Turk or by the inhabitants of Bosnia as by the rich Christians of the towns and by their own Bishops—foreigners who hardly spoke a syllable of the Slav language. Taxation fell heaviest upon the agricultural population, and in the towns the rich Christians were almost exempt from taxation; but they were not exempt from it in this way, that they were the publicans and tax-gatherers all over Bosnia, and he would remind the House that although great blame was to be laid on the Mahomedan Government for the way in which they taxed the people, yet the taxation which led to the present revolt was levied to pay interest to English bondholders, and the rich Christians were the tax-gatherers. He wished he could stop there, but he could not. The Slavs in Bosnia were not governed by Slavs, but by Greek Bishops — men who spoke a foreign tongue, who had no sympathy whatever with the people, and who received their position, just as Pashas were appointed in all parts of Turkey, because they could give the biggest bribe to the Patriarch of Constantinople. As they had received their own advance in that way, they in their turn sold cures to the highest bidder, and even the sacraments, he was sorry to say, were a monopoly in their hands. This was a disgraceful state of things, and it was a curious fact that the only people who ever raised a finger in defence of the poor Christians who were so ruled were the Mahomedan Government, in Constantinople, and their task was a difficult one, because in doing so, they had to contend not so much with Mahomedan Beys as with traitors in the Christian camps—with Christian publicans, and even with Christian Bishops. He (Mr. Hanbury), therefore, called on the House once and for ever to get rid of the idea that this was a question of religion at all. Further, if it were thought to be a question of nationality, it was very curious that not one of those people asked to be made independent of Turkey, as hon. Members must have remarked in reading the despatches. The people of Servia themselves did not seek for independence, because they felt convinced that they could not stand alone. The Slavs were greatly divided by habits, as well as by tongue and dialect. Even at the great Slav Congress held at Moscow so entirely distinct were the tongues spoken, that the discussions had to be carried on in the tongue of the hated German. As regarded religion the Slavs were also divided. The Greek Slav hated the Latin Slav at least as much as he hated the Turk. It would, indeed, be good for Europe, if the Slav Empire could be established; but there was this difficulty, the Slavs were not only divided by religion and by tongue, but also by their respective national songs—the national poetry of one Slav district breathing the most opposite sentiments of ambition. Their aims clashed, and, owing to their dissensions, they could not stand alone. Besides this, in any attempt to build up a Slavonic Empire they would have to deal not only with the Slav nationality of the Turkish territory, but that of Austrian territory likewise. He was perfectly sure that the Slav population of Austria had this recommendation in its favour, which could not be urged in favour of the Slav population of Bosnia, that whereas the latter were divided into Latin, Greek, and Mahomedan races, the Slav population in Austria was homogeneous both in race and religion, and were more advanced than were the Slavs of Turkey. Under such circumstances one would have expected to see the insurrection commence in Austria rather than in Turkey, and he should like to know the reason why it did not? [An hon. MEMBER: Because they are not oppressed.] An hon. Friend behind him said "because they were not oppressed." Well, if his hon. Friend was going to argue upon that assumption, he would be arguing upon a miserable delusion. He ventured to say that the Slavs who formed a portion of the Hungarian Kingdom suffered as much persecution at the hands of the Hungarian Government as their brothers did at the hands of the Porte. The question which had to be settled was not to be decided by sentiment apart from facts, as some seemed inclined to think. For himself he looked forward to the time when the Slav population would enter into the political life of Europe, and would act as a great bulwark in the South against Russia, for no people regarded with greater aversion the Russian advance towards the South than did the Southern Slavs. But Russia was at the present moment the only Power from whom they had received assistance, and he hoped that henceforth assistance would soon come to them from other quarters, and that England would, as far as her Treaty obligations permitted it, see that these unfortunate Slav Christians were not maltreated either by their own Government, the Mahomedan Beys, their own Bishops, or the rich Christians. England was absolute Ruler of the greatest Mahomedan Empire in the world, and he appealed to Parliament to remember that it was not only the poor Christians who were oppressed, but the same treatment was extended to the poor Mahomedans who lived under Turkish rule, and who had no one to raise a voice in their behalf. He hoped that no one after reading the despatches would come to any other conclusion than that the policy of England in relation to the matter had come out well. Other Powers might have plotted and intrigued, but the policy of England had from the beginning to the end of these difficulties been straightforward, honest, clear, and manly, and, whatever credit might be due to other Ministers, no blame could attach to the Minister who at present presided at the Foreign Office.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That this House is of opinion that Her Majesty's Government, while maintaining the respect due to existing Treaties, should exercise all their influence with the view of securing the common welfare and equal treatment of the various races and religions which are under the authority of the Sublime Porte."—(*Mr. Bruce.*)

MR. FORSYTH: I confess, Sir, I am greatly and deeply disappointed at the tone of the speeches of my two hon. Friends. My object in putting an Amendment on the Paper was to strengthen and give emphasis to what I thought was the policy shadowed forth in the Motion, and to indicate that the time had come when we could no longer put faith in the promises and professions of the Ottoman Porte, but must insist upon substantial guarantees as the price of our friendship — guarantees from which the Ottoman Porte could not escape, and which would be a security that its promises should be fulfilled. I had hoped that there was no serious or substantial difference between my hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce) and myself. But the speeches we have just heard were neither more nor less than an apology for Turkish misrule; and that of my hon. Friend the Member for Tamworth (Mr. Hanbury) might have been spoken by a Turkish Minister in a Turkish Divan. He defended the conduct of the Turkish Government, and did all he could to throw discredit upon the Christians. I am glad that this debate will not assume a Party character. It would be a deplorable thing if a question which affects the happiness of millions of the human race were degraded to the level of a Party contest. To-night will be exhibited the spectacle of the British Parliament united in one great object—how best to alleviate the sufferings of an afflicted and unhappy people, and put a stop to the barbarities of an oppressive Power. It has been said by Hallam, in his *History of England*, that the pulse of Europe beats according to the tone of our Parliaments. I hope if that was true when he wrote then it is equally true now. Sure I am that this night's debate will be read in every Capital of Europe, and the words of the speakers —so far as they are reported—will be weighed at Berlin, Vienna, St. Petersburg, and Constantinople; and if there is anything like unanimity of opinion and feeling amongst us — although from the speeches we have just listened to, I fear there will not be — this discussion may exercise no inconsiderable influence on the Cabinets of Europe, and shape the policy to be pursued on what is called the Eastern Question, but which I would rather call the Turkish difficulty. Now the causes of that difficulty may be summed up in two words — the corruption and misgovernment of the Ottoman Porte. If this assertion is denied it would be easy to prove it by a cloud of testimony which cannot be gainsaid; but I will content myself with quoting what has been said by Lord Derby in one of the despatches in the Papers laid before the House, where he states the case with only too much mildness and moderation. In a despatch of May 19th, 1876, Lord Derby says—

> "They—Her Majesty's Government—cannot conceal from themselves that the gravity of the situation has arisen, in a great measure, from the weakness and apathy of the Porte in dealing with the insurrection in its earlier stages, and from the want of confidence in Turkish statesmanship and powers of government, shown by the state of financial, military, and administrative collapse into which the country has been allowed to fall. The responsibility of this condition of affairs must rest with the Sultan and his Government, and all that can be done by the Government of Her Majesty is to give such friendly counsel as circumstances may require. They cannot control events to which the neglect of ordinary principles of good government may expose the Turkish Empire."

I may refer also to a remarkable appeal addressed last June, not by Christian Rayahs but by Mahomedans themselves to all the Cabinets of Europe, in which they say that the troubles of Turkey are owing to the iniquitous Government under which 30,000,000 of its subjects groan, and that there never was a serious intention of carrying out the reforms which have been so often promised. What was the real cause of the insurrection in the Herzegovina and Bosnia? It has been said by some of the organs of the Press and by others that that insurrection is due to foreign influence and foreign intrigue, but I deny that this is true. It is of the utmost importance that we should come to a correct conclusion on this point, for it ought materially to affect our opinions in this debate—and I hope the time will never come when the British Parliament will be asked to countenance or express its sympathy with wanton and unprovoked revolt. Mr. Holmes, our Consul in Bosnia, has, indeed, in a Memorandum, drawn up in March of the present year, "regarding the affairs of the Herzegovina," made the following assertions:—

> "To persons acquainted with the course of affairs during the last few years in Bosnia and the Herzegovina there can be no doubt that the insurrection was first brought about, and afterwards supported by, foreign influence. There was no particular reason, or any excess of oppression, to justify or occasion a rising of the people in 1875 beyond what has existed any time since 1860, but it was seen that the moment was propitious, inasmuch as the troops had been, during the few last years, gradually withdrawn from the Herzegovina until there were scarcely more than seven or eight battalions in the Province. A few individuals from Nevesinje, the richest and most prosperous district of the Herzegovina, and which might naturally have been considered the least likely to revolt, and which did not revolt during the former insurrection, were induced to avail themselves of some excuse to leave their homes and take refuge at Grahovo."

Nevesinje, where the insurrection broke out, so far from being the richest and most prosperous district of the Herzegovina, is one of the poorest and most barren. It is on the edge of a rocky plateau, surrounded by bare limestone mountains, and the crops, which are there never plentiful, had, in 1874, comparatively failed. In Turkey no crop can be gathered until the tax-gatherer has levied one-eighth of the value of the produce, and in Nevesinje the tax-gatherer did not come to exact the tithe until January, 1875. The peasants, to save themselves from starvation, had, in the meantime, gathered a portion of their crops. When the tax-gatherers came they put so preposterous a value upon the produce that the peasants refused to pay it. Upon this the Zaptiehs —the Mahomedan police—were let loose upon the people, and every kind of outrage was inflicted. They fled to Montenegro, and some of them appealed to the Emperor of Austria, who then happened to be in Dalmatia. They were induced to return under a safe conduct from the Turkish authorities, but on their way back were fired upon by the Turks, and afterwards many were murdered when they got back to Nevesinje. The rest fled to the mountains, and the insurrection began. To show the kind of oppression which the Bosnians had to suffer, and the normal mode in which the taxes are collected there, I will quote a passage from a work written by an English traveller—Mr. Evans—who was there last year, and who says, in his book *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina*—

> "In the heat of summer men are stripped naked, and tied to a tree smeared over with honey or other sweet stuff and left to the tender mercies of the insect world. For winter extor-

tion it is found convenient to bind people to stakes and leave them bare-footed to be frost-bitten; or at other times they are shoved into a pig-sty and cold water poured on them. A favourite plan is to drive a party of Rayahs up a tree or into a chamber, and then smoke them with green wood. Instances are recorded of Bosnian peasants being buried up to their heads in earth and left to repent at leisure."

I might quote many more such examples, but this will be enough.

"Accipe nunc Danaûm insidias, et crimine ab uno
Disce omnes."

Can we wonder, then, that those who are of the same race and religion, and who are in close contact with these people, should be stirred to the utmost sympathy with their sufferings? How can it be otherwise, when the people of this country, who are separated from them by the distance of the Continent of Europe, and are aliens from them in blood, language, and religion, are so profoundly affected by their wrongs? There is no doubt that there was a strong sympathy for the insurgents felt by the Slavonic population of Russia and Austria; but I defy any one to prove that this disposition has been fomented by Austrian or Russian intrigue. Why should we attempt to defend the iniquities of Turkey towards her subject population? If they are not true, let them be denied; if they are true, surely all our sympathies must be in favour of those oppressed nationalities. I should have liked to point out in my Amendment that the true solution of the question is not by enforcing the policy of Turkey or getting guarantees, but by endeavouring to obtain the practical independence of those provinces, so as to place them in the same condition as Roumania and Servia. North of the Danube is Roumania, consisting of two Provinces — Moldavia and Wallachia. A few years ago she was as much oppressed as any of the subject-Provinces, but since she has obtained her independence she has become most prosperous. Bulgaria is south of the Danube, and her people are by the confession of all writers some of the gentlest, kindest, and most amiable of mankind. Servia is like Roumania—a free Principality. In Roumania the population is 4,500,000, in Bulgaria it is 2,000,000, in Servia 1,300,000, and in Bosnia 1,200,000. Here, then, is a population of Slavonic people not fewer than 9,000,000, who are perfectly fit for free government, and who would know how to use their liberty when they have it. I want to know whether the proper solution of this question would not be that these people should become so far free that the Porte could not any longer oppress them—that they should be placed in the same position as Servia and Roumania. We are afraid of Russia; and we have a right to be afraid of seeing her in Constantinople. But the strength of Russia in this matter arises from the oppression of the Slavonic people; and she has always a reason for interfering as the champion of humanity and the redresser of their wrongs. But if we had these free States we should have a belt of 9,000,000 interposed to the South between Russia and Turkey. It is impossible that we should ever allow Russia to seize on Constantinople, but Russian ambition is a great bugbear. I deprecate the idea of a member of the House of Romanoff sitting on the Throne of Turkey; but let us be just to Russia. In 1826 Russia had conquered Moldavia and Wallachia. She had crossed the Balkan, and was in possession of Adrianople. Constantinople lay at her feet, and she might have seized it without the slightest opposition. But, on the representation of the other Powers, she retired, and, by the Treaty of Adrianople, contented herself with retaining a small strip of territory on the left of the Pruth. Russia knew that if she were to seize Constantinople it would be at the cost of an European war, in which she would have to face Austria, Germany, and England. I should like to see steps taken to persuade Turkey to give up those provinces, and make them as independent as Servia and Roumania. We should insist not on promises—I put no faith whatever in promises, which have been broken over and over again—but on stringent and effective guarantees for the execution of the promises which Turkey may make. There ought to be a mixed commission of the different foreign Consuls in Bosnia and Bulgaria to see those promises carried out, and if they were not performed—if oppression still continued—I will go so far as to say there ought to be a military occupation of those provinces by Austria and Russia to act as a police, in order to see the engagements of Turkey performed. In conclusion, I beg to move the Amendment of which I have given Notice.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF thought it must be a great satisfaction to the House that the debate should be held before the Session concluded. He deprecated partial statements unsupported by authentic Papers. There had unfortunately been extra-Parliamentary utterances on this subject. In the month of October the noble Lord the Minister for Foreign Affairs had told an audience at Liverpool, that we should hear little more of the armed insurrection in the Turkish Provinces, and he informed a deputation consisting chiefly of hon. Members opposite, introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, that the sending of the Fleet to Besika Bay was not susceptible of the interpretation popularly placed upon it. In the House of Lords, Lord Napier and Lord Hammond had both referred to the despatch of the Fleet to Besika Bay with approval, as an instance of promptitude and vigorous policy, and had attributed it to a different reason from that given by the noble Lord, and yet the noble Lord had not in his place in the other House made any reference to the opinions which they had expressed. He wished that these matters should be cleared up. The noble Lord had informed the deputation that the reason why the Fleet had been sent, was that our Ambassador at Constantinople was afraid of attacks on the Christian population, especially after the massacre at Salonica. Yet the despatches stated some time before the Mediterranean Fleet was reinforced, that all possibility of disturbance had been prevented by the precautions taken by the Porte, and that everything was quiet at Salonica. The country had been misled by that statement, for the truth of the matter was that on the 31st of May, writing to Sir Henry Elliot, the noble Lord said, he "should be watchful lest, under cover of protecting the Christian population, or on some similar pretext, a proposal may be made to summon the Fleets to Constantinople, in which case Her Majesty's Government would have to reflect on the course they should pursue in the event of so grave an infraction of Treaties." Her Majesty's Government asked for information as to the action of the other Powers in this respect, and soon after their despatch was written, the Fleet in Besika Bay was raised from three ships to 20. He did not in any way object to that step, for he considered that the noble Lord was perfectly justified in sending a Fleet to Besika Bay, not by way of menace or threat, but as a convincing proof that he was ready to fulfil the obligations we had undertaken by Treaty; but he objected to the discrepancies which existed between the statements made by the Minister out-of-doors and the statements in either House and the Papers presented to Parliament. The same course had been taken with regard to the Suez Canal Shares. They were told at one time that a great political act had been performed, and at another it was said to be a mere purchase of shares. What was the real position of England at the present moment? Having sent our Fleet into the Mediterranean and shown our readiness to maintain Treaty engagements, we had a right to speak boldly and give Turkey advice which might not be palatable to her. Turkey was now passing through an ordeal more critical than any she had ever gone through before, even in connection with the independence of Egypt, Greece, or Syria, because the Provinces in insurrection were surrounded by neighbours having views and interests of their own. As to the Austrian Government, it was impossible for them not to sympathize with the oppressed Slavs. It had been said that those who were under Austrian rule were as much oppressed as those under Turkish rule; but far from the Slavonic subjects of Austria being ill-treated, they occupied a very favourable position. Nearly the whole of the Austrian Navy was composed of Slavs. Half of her Army was Slavs, and he was informed that a large portion of her superior officers belonged to that nationality. There was a reported movement in Austria for the annexation of Bosnia, and he was informed that within the last few days some of the inspired newspapers had written in support of that view. The head of the Austrian Government was a Hungarian, who could not be in sympathy with the Slavs; but still the Austrian Government could not prevent its Slav population stimulating insurrection for the amelioration of the condition of the Slavs in Turkey. The Austrian and

Russian Consuls at Constantinople attended the embarkation there of 700 armed Servians and Montenegrins; while the Russian Government, which was subject to the influence of as strong a public opinion as any Government in Europe, could not prevent *pronunciamientos* by its own regiments in favour of the insurgents in Turkey. Russia, he believed, did not want to go to war; but if fighting went on and villages and communities were involved, European complications were to be feared. As to Montenegro desiring territory, it was a progressive country, and the late and the present Princes had done all in their power to advance the civilization of their small domain. They regretted they had not the means to build houses and make roads; and the reply to the complaint that their people did nothing but fight, was that they had nothing else to do, because they could not bring their timber, wine, and fish down the river to any port where they could sell the produce of their country. They were an industrious people when they could get anything to do; nearly all the gardeners in Constantinople were Montenegrins; but the foolish policy of the Turkish Government kept them cooped up in a district where they could not develop agriculture. Only let a port be given them, and they would soon become absorbed in peaceful pursuits and gradually lose their warlike character. It was a mistake to suppose that the feelings of the Montenegrins were strongly in favour of Russia, for the fact was their supposed leaning towards that country was of the nature of political gratitude—the hope of favours to come. In 1804, the Diet told a Russian Envoy that they would maintain fidelity to Russia, only on condition that they did not share the position of subjects of that country. The idea that the insurrection originated with or was carried on by foreign Powers was a great delusion; they could not excite insurrection unless there was some internal cause for discontent. Could any foreign Power produce a revolution in this country? These people were badly treated, and it did not require any foreign Power to stimulate them to revolt. They did not desire to be taken out of the Ottoman Empire. In speaking of the Sultan, Consul Holmes informed us, they took their caps off. They thought he did not know of the manner in which they were treated, and they desired their grievances to be made known to the Government at Constantinople. Had Servia no cause to complain when her frontiers were colonized by Circassians who plundered the country? If it was difficult for Austria and Russia to prevent their subjects showing sympathy with the insurgents, how much more difficult would it be for Servia? It was useless to contend against the existence of misgovernment in these [Provinces. The English Government had acknowledged it by joining in the Andrassy Note; and the Turks had acknowledged it by publishing firmans and *Iradès* to carry out the reforms they had promised 20 years ago. The complaints made were formalized in the Memorandum given to Consul Holmes; they had been confirmed in a letter to *The Times* and in the book of Mr. Evans, who in the course of his travels passed through the revolted districts. The complaints included the refusal of education, the neglect of the resources of the country, and the discouragement of foreign capital. The demands made were that their churches should not be desecrated; that they should have equal rights with the Turks before the law; that the tithe farmers should take no more from them than they were entitled to take; that Christian girls and women should no longer be molested by Turks; the free exercise of religion; and the abolition of enforced and unpaid labour. The complaints and demands were substantially those of the French peasantry before the great French Revolution, which was the beginning of a new era in civilization, simply because the truth was recognized that every one should be equal before the law. This had never yet been recognized in Turkey. In no case was Christian evidence admitted against Mussulman evidence in Osmanli tribunals; and this was not entirely the fault of the Turk so much as the result of failure to establish a system of centralization in a country where there was no properly established administration. That was brought out in the remarkable book of Mr. Palgrave, which showed that there was a better feeling in the Provinces under the old feudal system than there was now when officers were sent out from Constantinople who could have no local interests or sympathies.

With regard to the atrocities which had been perpetrated, there could be no doubt that such atrocities had been perpetrated by both sides, and he thought that some energetic measures ought to be taken by the Government to put a stop to them. It was not sufficient to have sent a subordinate officer to inquire into them. In 1845, when great atrocities were committed in Spain, the Government of the day sent Lord Eliot and General Wyld to obtain assurances from both sides that there was to be a mitigation of cruelties and barbarities; and he did not see why some military officer of rank should not have been sent into Bulgaria and the insurgent districts to come to some terms both with insurgents and Turks to prevent a further perpetration of them. What was to be done under existing circumstances? The hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. Forsyth) had suggested the establishment of the independence of these Provinces; but he (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) would rather not make any suggestion in that direction. The idea of the hon. Member for Tamworth (Mr. Hanbury) that it was desired to establish a great Serbian kingdom was equally fallacious, for the Papers which had been laid upon the Table in no way countenanced that theory. In 1826, when war broke out between Greece and Turkey, the Three Powers—England, France, and Russia—offered their mediation. Had Turkey accepted the offer she would not have lost Greece, because the Great Powers would have recommended that Greece should acknowledge the Suzerainty of the Turkish Empire. He, however, did not see why the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office should see any difficulty in suggesting a meeting of the Great Powers to settle the question. In one of his despatches, the noble Lord said he did not see that anything could be done, unless by using force, but no ground was stated as the basis of such an opinion. If an armistice were proposed, and if a Military Commission such as was sent out to Syria were detached from a Congress or Conference, they might visit these Provinces as had been done in the case of Roumania, and suggest a system of government which, while acknowledging the supremacy of the Ottoman Empire, would give the population of the Slavonic Provinces some system of free government. Turkey had shown her great confidence in England by joining in the Andrassy Note, and as she had a few years ago entered the European system, it would be our duty to remind her that she could only expect to be recognized as a European Power so long as she governed her subjects on European principles. He concluded by seconding the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the words "opinion that" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is the duty of the British Government, as one of the Powers which, under the Treaty of 1856, guaranteed the independence of the Ottoman Empire, in any steps that may be taken with a view to the restoration of peace between the Ottoman Porte and her Slavonic provinces to obtain for those provinces adequate and effectual guarantees for good and impartial government irrespective of race or creed,"—(*Mr. Forsyth*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE *: If, under ordinary circumstances, I had to reply to the four hon. Members opposite, [the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce), the hon. Member for Tamworth (Mr. Hanbury), the hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. Forsyth), and the hon. Member for Christchurch (Sir H. Drummond Wolff),] who have all so extensive an acquaintance with foreign affairs, I should probably feel my strength unequal to the effort. But those hon. Members have so bullied one another, and—in the case of one of them at least—have so belaboured the Government of which they are the supporters, that I confess my own task is very materially lightened. It has been stated that I wish to move a Vote of Censure upon the Government, and I am aware that the words I had originally placed upon the Paper were technically susceptible of that interpretation. In order, however, to place my meaning beyond doubt, I have so altered them that they now apply only to the future, and therefore cannot be construed into a Vote of Censure. At the same time I shall make some criticisms upon the past conduct of the Government. In a debate of this kind no Government can expect to be above criticism; least of all the present Government, for when they came into office there was no subject on which their friends were so confident as their foreign policy. Now, at last, so it was then said, the country was going to see statesmanship, spirited yet conciliatory, firm yet cautious, and the honour of England, so long neglected, was going to be effectually upheld. It would seem as if some malignant fate had overheard these confident anticipations, and had determined to give those on whose behalf they were uttered, a full opportunity of proving their mettle. Hardly had the present Government been in office more than 18 months, before it was evident that more than one difficult question would demand their attention, and that the East was once more propounding for solution the riddle which statesmanship has not yet answered. What the House, then, has amongst other things to consider, is whether the Government, in their treatment of this difficult question, has hitherto fulfilled the confident anticipations of their supporters. In replying to this question, it is indispensable to have a clear idea of the condition of the Provinces of European Turkey, now the theatre of the insurrection. I shall try and satisfy my hon. Friend the Member for Tamworth (Mr. Hanbury), and not treat this subject as a question of religion merely—as a question between Mahomedan and Christian alone; nor shall I quote the book of Mr. Evans, or any other author, however interesting or well-informed; but I shall confine myself to the Papers on the Table. I fearlessly say that out of those Papers, and out of those Papers alone, it can be shown that a state of things exists in European Turkey which no Government with an atom of self-respect would tolerate for an instant. The promises which each Sultan has successively made, especially in the Hatts of the 3rd November, 1839, and of the 18th February, 1856, each Sultan has successively broken. The only real change which has taken place in Turkey since the accession of the Sultan Mahmoud II. has been the substitution of a centralized bureaucratic system in the place of the old *quasi*-feudal system. The latter had many faults. It had also certain virtues; but it has been swept away, virtues and faults together; and a system of which the faults are but too conspicuous, and the virtues are far to seek, now reigns in its stead. Already, in 1859, Prince Gortschakoff called the attention of the Powers of Europe to the slight importance apparently attached by the Porte to the performance of her promises. Sir Henry Bulwer was thereupon instructed to issue a set of questions to the English Consuls, which he accompanied with a covering despatch, between the lines of which it could be read that a pleasant answer—pleasant, I mean, to the Porte—would not be altogether disagreeable at home. The Consuls, however—and to their honour be it spoken—uttered the truth; and the truth, as it often is, was very disagreeable indeed to the Ottoman Porte. Now I turn to the state of things revealed by the Papers on the Table. They show that the civil administration, instead of being a protection, is a terror to the country; that the judicial tribunals are hopelessly corrupt, that civil servants and magistrates alike are a set of vampires; that the taxes are bad in principle and collected by still worse methods; that tithes are levied, and levied in kind; that the roads are neglected, public works uncared for, the railways jobbed, and the whole moral and material condition of the country retrograding. The reign of violence, tempered by corruption, is complete; and we in England, who believe that there is nothing worse than to hold Turkish bonds, have yet to learn that there is something a great deal worse—to be held in them. The system which I have described is the cause of the rebellion. The promises of reform, so glibly and so frequently repeated by Sultans and Pashas, are no longer listened to. The populations of these countries have risen with arms in their hands, and are determined to work out their own salvation. It has been said that the rebellion was got up by foreign emissaries. Was there ever a rebellion of which this has not been said? But assume — and I do not deny — that foreigners have entered those countries; men of the same religion and nationality, though owning a different political allegiance. What stronger argument can be used against the Turkish Government? Imagine foreign emissaries coming to stir up a rebellion in England. They would speedily find their way into the nearest horsepond. But in Turkey they are welcomed. Again, let me ask if other great rebellions have not also been largely assisted by foreigners? We all know the story of the rise of the Dutch Republic. We know that Englishmen fought in the ranks of the Dutch armies. Was that held to prove the mildness of the rule of Philip II.? During the Thirty Years' War, Scotchmen fought in the armies of Protestant Germany. Did that prove the justice of the Catholic cause? In any case, whatever the opinion of the hon. Member for Tamworth may be, it was not the opinion of the Governments of Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary, that the movement in the Turkish Provinces was fictitious. The Ministers of those countries met, and towards the close of last year drew up what is known as the Andrassy Note, in which they recommended the Sublime Porte to promulgate a new scheme of reform and to carry it out. And here I would observe that the position of England in the matter of the Andrassy Note does not seem to me very dignified or creditable. The Ministers of the three Great Powers meet together, and settle their policy without in any way consulting England. England is left standing entirely apart from and outside the European concert. The Andrassy Note is left at our door, is served upon us like a writ or a summons, and we after a time, having ascertained that the Sublime Porte has no objection to promulgating some new reforms, accede to it. The Andrassy Note proved a failure, as everybody knew it would. The Turks had no intention of carrying out the promised reforms, and the insurgents did not believe in the professions of the Porte. In the month of April Prince Gortschakoff told the English Ambassador at St. Petersburg that "the Porte could not carry out the engagements she had taken; it was impossible for her to do so." The Salonica outrages happening at this moment quickened the action of the Russian Chancellor. Hence the meeting at Berlin, and the Berlin Memorandum, which was drawn up by the two Chancellors and the Austrian Minister, with the same disregard for the existence of England as a Great Power, which they had exhibited on a former occasion. The propositions it advanced were vague and unsatisfactory. They bore the mark of divided counsels, and the matter and the manner being both equally objectionable, the Memorandum was rejected by the Foreign Secretary, with the general consent of the English people. The Foreign Secretary thereupon resolved to pursue a policy of the strictest non-intervention. He was informed by the Austrian Government that in their opinion—

> "as between the two extremes, that is to say, between a scheme of pacification energetically carried out and an attitude of absolute non-interference,"

there was no middle course, and he resolved to choose the attitude of absolute non-interference, although, as appears from these Papers, the rejection of the Berlin Memorandum had already been near impairing the cordial character of the relations between this country and Russia. What, however, is most remarkable, is that while the Foreign Minister of England was assuming this attitude, the Prime Minister of England had been following a very different line of conduct. A large fleet was sent to Besika Bay. By expressions sonorous, ambiguous, and magnificent, he led this House, and the country, and the nations of Europe, to suppose that the moral, if not the material support of England, was being given to the Turks. But now we are assured by the Foreign Secretary that the fleet was only sent to Besika Bay to protect the English residents on shore, and that this gigantic and unprecedented armament was gathered together for this harmless purpose. Really the Government could not complain if their conduct was misunderstood; so altogether disproportionate to the object were the means employed to attain it. When Guy Faux was found in the cellars underneath the Houses of Parliament, with ever so many barrels of gunpowder, with matches on his person, and a lantern in his hand, he was asked what he wanted down there; and he replied that he was the most harmless and inoffensive man in the world—he was only minding the coal cellar. But it was answered—"Are all these barrels of gunpowder, these matches, and this lantern, necessary in order to mind the coal cellar?" Well, in like manner, the Government must not be astonished if the public wanted to know if it really was expected to believe that all these turreted ships and armour-plated vessels were necessary in order to protect the English inhabitants on the shores of the Bosphorus. I confess, indeed, that if the Prime Minister were to ask me to quote any particular expression or set of words which, used by him, justify me in asserting that he led the public to suppose that the moral and material support of England was to be given to Turkey, I could not do so. [Mr. BOURKE: Hear, hear!] But really I think I am justified in appealing to the effect of the language of the Prime Minister, and my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State and his Colleagues must consider not only the House, but the country and the nations of Europe, to be all a pack of fools, if he believes that without the slightest justification they unanimously arrived at the conclusion they did, as to the meaning of the language of the right hon. Gentleman. In one of the plays of Aristophanes there is a scene in which a Persian Envoy is introduced to the citizens of Athens. He is a man of great rank and dignity, and so much in the confidence of his sovereign, that he is known as the King's Eye. The citizens of Athens ask him what he has to say about foreign affairs; and he replies in language very grand and very mysterious. And all the bystanders are mightily impressed, till some plain-minded person plucks up his courage, and asks—"What does it all really mean?" And then a person who knows the King's Eye of old, replies—"Well, if you particularly want to know, it means nothing at all. The King's Eye has been laughing at you all round." Well, I hope I shall not be saying anything disrespectful of the Prime Minister if I call him the Queen's Eye, or even the Eye of the Empress. We asked him what he had to say about foreign affairs, and he replid in phrases very grand and very mysterious, and we all believed that something tremendous was happening. But at last some plain-minded persons, led by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright), asked—"What does all this really mean?" And then the Foreign Minister, who had known the Prime Minister a very long time, came forward, and animated no doubt by the affection he bore to his Colleagues, replied—"Oh, if you particularly wish to know, it all means nothing at all. The Queen's Eye has been laughing at you all round."

Now, let me ask the House to consider if there was no other course to pursue than that adopted by the Government. I recollect that Mr. Fox, when speaking in 1792 on a question germane to that before the House—I mean the Russian Armament—said in reply to Mr. Jenkinson, that whether an insulated policy which disdained all Continental connection whatever, or a system of extensive foreign connection, or a medium between these two was the interest of England, were topics very proper to be discussed; but, of the three, he confidently pronounced the middle course to be, under ordinary circumstances, the best for this country. I want to know why the Government did not enter on the course recommended by Mr. Fox, and without having either recourse to arms, or standing absolutely aloof, did not enter on a course of diplomatic action, making a counter proposition to the Berlin Note, instead of remaining satisfied with merely rejecting it. In the month of June they had an opportunity such as may not recur, for a short time after the rejection of the Berlin Note, Count Schouvaloff proceeded, in the name of the Emperor of Russia, to propose, as the best solution of existing difficulties, the establishment of "vassal and tributary autonomous States in Bosnia and the Herzegovina," the cession of a port on the Adriatic and some adjacent portions of territory to Montenegro, and of the fortress of Little Zvornik, so long a subject of dispute, to Servia. Here, then, was a clear and definite proposal on the part of one, and that the most important, of the three Powers. Austria, however, had objections to make. The Foreign Minister eagerly adopted those objections, thereby giving them a force they would otherwise have lacked, and, as clearly appears from the despatch of June 30th, from Mr. Macdonell to the Foreign Secretary, thereby encouraged Count Andrassy to state to the Court of Berlin, which had not, and, so far as appears from these Papers, never has committed itself against the proposal of Russia, that under no circumstances would he come into it. Here is the despatch—

"Mr. Macdonell to the Earl of Derby.—
(Received June 30.)
"Berlin, June 30, 1876.

"(Telegraphic.)

"Count Karolyi informs me that, in consequence of Mr. Ffrench having communicated to

Count Andrassy your Lordship's despatch to Lord A. Loftus of the 14th instant, he had been instructed to state to the German Government that his Government would disapprove and object to any possible autonomy for the Provinces in insurrection.

"He asked me if a similar communication had been made by me to the German Government. I answered that I had not made any such communication."

I said that the support of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs for England gave the Austrian objections a force they would otherwise have lacked, and I said so because the internal position of Austria—with her dual Government and her 17 local Parliaments in Cisleithania alone, not to mention the local Parliament at Agram, of which my hon. Friend the Member for Tamworth (Mr. Hanbury) seems to have so low an opinion—would not have allowed Austria to resist the combined voices of England and of Russia. There is no solution of this Eastern question possible which will not be more or less disagreeable to Austria and Hungary; and what a Foreign Minister has to look for is not the policy agreeable, but the policy the least disagreeable to them. It is clear from these Papers that Hungary will not allow any annexation of Slavonic territory to the kingdom, for fear of disturbing the balance of power within it; and it is also clear that it is not the interest of Austria to see one large Slavonic kingdom established between the Danube and the Balkan, because of the attraction it would exercise on Dalmatia. Consequently, next to the maintenance of the *status in quo*, and trusting to the chapter of accidents, the establishment of vassal and tributary States, though not without considerable danger to Austria, is the policy least liable to objection at Vienna. Now, what were the reasons which weighed with Count Andrassy, and so impressed the mind of the Foreign Secretary that he shrunk from the adoption of the Russian proposal? They are summed up in the despatches of the Foreign Secretary of June 27 and June 28 to Sir Andrew Buchanan and Lord Augustus Loftus. I shall say a few words on each of them. First, comes the existence of a Mahomedan population, 600,000 strong, in Bosnia, and the probability of the Mahomedan population suffering great wrongs under Christian rule. Now the present state of things is that the Christian population is suffering great oppression under Mahomedan rule. There is consequently a choice of difficulties. I confess myself that the existence of this Mahomedan population seems to me to furnish rather an argument for than against diplomatic intervention. Diplomacy might gain guarantees for the protection of this population, which otherwise it would be hard to obtain. I would in any case point out, that if any hon. Member will run his eye over the Treaties regulating the position of Servia, he will find that diplomacy has not been unable to deal with a similar question in the case of that country. Next, Count Andrassy states certain objections to the idea of confining the Government of Bosnia to a hereditary and *quasi*-independent Pasha, like the Khedive of Egypt. But before taking notice of these objections, the House would, I think, like to know if anybody has ever seriously contemplated such a plan. Then it is stated that if autonomy is given to Bosnia, it must be given to Bulgaria, where conditions more favourable to autonomy exist than in Bosnia; so the Austrian Minister himself, with great truth, observes. But I do not think that this circumstance, however much it may be an objection at Vienna, will be considered an objection in the House of Commons. Next it is added, that if Bosnia and the Herzegovina are made autonomous, Servia, Montenegro, and Roumania may demand complete independence, and Greece may ask for a rectification of her frontiers. All this is quite true, but may not these same demands be advanced now? In fact, have we not some reason for supposing that they are being actually advanced? Then the Foreign Minister of England concludes by saying that he is not prepared to draw up a constitution in detail for the Turkish Provinces. To which I reply, that nobody ever asked that he should do so, but that he should enter into communication with the other great European Powers having Treaty engagements with Turkey, on the basis proposed by the Russian Government—namely, that of granting a certain degree of autonomy to these insurgent Provinces.

And here I wish to observe that the names of the greatest statesmen of England may be cited in favour of granting autonomy to these provinces. My hon. Friend the Member for Poole

(Mr. Evelyn Ashley) has called my attention to a passage in the Life of Lord Palmerston, from which it appears that that eminent statesman foresaw the possibility, if not the probability, of such a solution being adopted at no distant date, in the case of the Herzegovina at least. Lord Russell, in a recent pamphlet, has advocated the idea; Lord Stratford de Redcliffe—and I can quote no higher authority—in a letter written at an early period of these troubles used the following words:—

> "The Herzegovina and Bosnia might be put in a state of vassalage to the Sultan, similar to that in which Servia stands. A belt of such principalities, including Moldavia, Wallachia, and Montenegro, interposed between Russia and Austria on the one side, and Turkey on the other, might operate as a protection to the Ottoman dominion in Europe, and a pledge of durable peace in that quarter. In fairness to the Turkish proprietors, facilities would have to be given for the settlement elsewhere of such of them as chose to emigrate, and for the sale of their lands and houses. On the other hand, the Sultan's concession would carry with it a just claim for tribute from the emancipated Provinces."

Last but not least, the present Foreign Secretary, speaking 12 years ago, expressed himself thus—

> "I believe the breaking up of the Turkish Empire to be only a question of time, and probably not a very long time. The Turks have played their part in history; they have had their day, and that day is over; and I confess I do not understand, except it be from the influence of old diplomatic traditions, the determination of your older statesmen to stand by the Turkish rule, whether right or wrong. I think we are making for ourselves enemies of races which will very soon become in Eastern countries dominant races, and I think we are keeping back countries by whose improvement, we, as the great traders of the world, should be the great gainers, and that we are doing this for no earthly advantage, present or prospective. I admit that England has an interest, and a very strong one, in the neutrality of Egypt, and some interest also, though to a less extent, in Constantinople not falling into the hands of a great European Power; but, these two points set aside, I can conceive no injury arising to Great Britain from any transfer of power which might affect the Turkish Empire."

But I may be told, this is an ideal plan. The circumstances of place and time are hostile to it. But what are the facts? Nobody pretends that these insurgent Provinces are prosperous or very civilized communities, but they are at least as prosperous and as civilized as were Servia, Roumania, and Greece, when you obtained a practical independence for those countries. I am not ashamed of confessing to a belief—it may seem unfashionable to some persons—that free institutions will of themselves give a force and vigour to a country, which in a short time will work marvels in the way even of material development; and if I wished to find an illustration of the truth of this, it would be in Servia and Roumania that I would go to seek it. Those countries are no longer the same countries they were before 1829. They were then parts of Asia, but are now European, and I say this—Give Bosnia, give Bulgaria the same form of government, and you will find the same results. Now as to time: and this is a very important matter, for the Foreign Secretary committed himself in the interview with Count Schouvaloff on June 21st, to which I have already alluded, to this position—namely, that whatever intervention might be deemed advisable by the Government, would be more likely to be efficacious at the termination than at the beginning of the struggle. Now, on this subject, the Russian Ambassador made a reply, which I shall read to the House. He said—

> "The Russian Government must dissent from the opinion that it would be useless to look for a practical solution till hostilities had resulted in some definite issue. They had always held, on the contrary, that the Powers should use their best efforts to avert a fanatical war of extermination, both on grounds of general humanity and for their own interests. The consequences of such a war would be incalculable. It would ruin both victors and vanquished, and would smother in its infancy the future prosperity of those countries, from the civilization of which Europe had every advantage to gain."

Now, these words seem to me to be the words of wisdom. They are also the words of humanity, and I believe the House would have been glad if I could have told them they were the words of the Foreign Secretary of England, instead of being those of the Russian Ambassador.

Why, then, I venture to ask, were the Russian proposals rejected? I cannot help fearing that it was because of that unworthy suspicion of everything Russian that seems at times to seize hold of this country. I am far indeed from asserting that under no circumstances can England and Russia have divergent interests. It is not desirable that the control of the Mediterranean should pass absolutely into the hands of Russia. I can imagine that at some future day English and Russian interests may come into collision on the frontiers of India, but I also believe that a prudent diplomacy may avert the danger of these things happening. Russian influence on the Mediterranean must exist. You can no more prevent it than Russia can prevent your influence existing in the Channel and the North Sea. This constant fear and suspicion of Russia did not always exist in this country. Lord Chatham once said "he was altogether a Russ," and when Mr. Pitt wanted to go to war with Russia about the fortress of Oczakow, he was stopped by the unanimous voice of the English people. But I may be told that in the last century Russia was regard as a useful counterpoise to French ambition, and that the circumstances of the time are since then entirely altered. Let me assume that that is the case, and I have no wish to deny it. Let me also assume for a moment the truth of everything which the most extreme Russophobist could put forward about Russian designs, and then let me ask what greater obstacle you could interpose to the advance of the Russians on Constantinople than by covering the Balkan Peninsula with free and independent States? Is Roumania an assistance or an obstacle to a Russian advance on Constantinople? Would a self-governing Bulgaria be an assistance or an obstacle? Let hon. Members look at the map, and they will hardly hesitate as to their reply. Does anybody think that countries enjoying free institutions would wish to be absorbed into a despotically governed Empire? As well say that England would wish to be annexed to a French Empire.

And now, in conclusion, let me point out what has happened since the Foreign Secretary rejected the Russian proposals. The war has extended itself over a large area; Servia and Montenegro have joined it; the contest has assumed a character of the utmost ferocity, and threatens to prolong its existence. We are told every day that the Turks are going to take Belgrade tomorrow. My own fear is that this struggle is going to degenerate into a guerilla warfare, which may go on indefinitely. The country is well adapted for such a war, covered as it is with long mountain ranges and thick woods; and the termination of the struggle, the happy period marked out by the Foreign Secretary for mediation, when he is to appear and distribute blessings all round, may still be very far distant. Each day that passes makes a settlement more difficult. The religious hatreds which are being aroused, the atrocities which are being committed, are dividing Turk and Slav wider and wider apart. The sympathies of the Russian population, the desire of Roumania and Greece to aggrandize themselves, may extend the contest yet further. All the dangers foreseen by Count Andrassy grow greater instead of less. Therefore it is that I have placed an Amendment on the Paper — the Forms of the House will not, indeed, permit me to move it—urging on the Government, even at this eleventh hour, to attempt by diplomatic action, while there is yet time, to stay this conflict, and obtain a measure of self-government for the insurgent Provinces. They will not, indeed, be able to propose it with the same prospect of success with which they might have suggested it in June, but I believe that each hour that passes makes intervention more, rather than less, difficult. Delay becomes more and more perilous. Day by day, month by month, as the struggle deepens, it will become harder to confine it within the present limits, and your policy, begun apparently in order to check Russian advance, may end in promoting it, while England, the mother of free nations, will stand convicted before the eyes of Europe of having tried to check the enfranchisement of an oppressed people, without even having had the miserable satisfaction of succeeding in the attempt.

Mr. J. HOLMS said, that he was but little anxious to criticize the action of the Government up to a certain time in relation to this question. He would far rather make use of the occasion to press forward that which was more practical, than to criticize the doings of the Government, who had followed, to a great extent, the traditional policy of the Foreign Office, which had been pursued for generations—namely, to maintain the Turkish rule in the East. Every Chamber of Commerce, every body in the country, was most anxious to know what was to be the future policy of the Government in reference to the Eastern Question. The uncertainty of the state of affairs affected more or less the trade of England, because looking at the state of the struggle now between Turkey and her revolted Provinces, no one could tell what would be the results a short time hence, for whether Turkey or Servia won there were sure to be complications. If Turkey won, her triumph would be merely temporary, and she would continue to be offensive to Europe as she had been in times past. If, on the other hand, success should attend the arms of those rebellious northern Provinces and they should conquer, what would be the future of Turkey? We knew that Austria, Russia, and Prussia were looking with desiring eyes upon the Turks. It was therefore wise of the people of this country to wish to know distinctly from the Government what was the course which they intended to pursue. He asked the House to consider what had been the state of Turkey during the last 20 years. It was shown that Turkey had been during that time as "a dead body" among the nations of Europe, and that she had not adopted any European habit but one—namely, she had accumulated (and, he might add, repudiated) a great National Debt. He might refer to a great speech which was made by the celebrated statesman Burke in the House on the 29th of March, 1791, in which he said that the Turks had nothing to do with European Power, they despised and contemned all Christian Princes and people as infidels, and that savages as they were, they seemed to do nothing but spread ruin and desolation, and should not be admitted to recognition with the other European Powers. He (Mr. Holms) did not think that the character which was given of the Turks in 1791 by that distinguished statesman was different from that of the present day, and they found that the opinion recently expressed by Lord Derby corresponded with it. The Turks had played their game in such a manner that they had their day, and that day was gone. Mr. Cobden, in 1853, expressed himself strongly in reference to the Turks, and had his opinion and words been acted upon this country would not have been dragged into the Crimean War. He thought that, having regard to our past policy, and remembering the great Christian population that there was in Turkey, this country should declare clearly and distinctly that it would prefer to see some other Government than a Mahomedan Government ruling in Turkey; and that not in relation to Christians alone, but to the poorer classes of Turks as well—in truth, the march of civilization had come to a stand-still in Turkey. He could not but think that if the people of England had been informed in 1853 of the real character and state of affairs in Turkey, and of the real condition of Russia, they should never have had the Crimean War. Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Sidney Herbert believed that the British forces and their ally were to take Sebastopol in a few days, Lord Raglan and Admiral Dundas were of the same opinion, and formed strange estimates of the Russian forces, the one estimating them at 30,000, the other at 120,000 strong. They had had a Sebastopol Committee, who, in their Report, showed the state of ignorance which the English Government were in at that day. Lord Aberdeen in his evidence stated that the English Ministers were in a state of deplorable darkness on the subject, and acknowledged that the country was getting better information from the Press than they got from the Government, just as was the case in the present day. *The Daily News,* on the 23rd of June, showed that while the Foreign Office appeared to be in ignorance of the atrocities committed by the Turks in Bulgaria, 20,000 to 30,000 people had been brutally murdered. The Prime Minister stated, in answer to a question put to him respecting those assassinations, that Her Majesty's Government had not had any information of such atrocities. Now he (Mr. Holms) could not conceive how the Foreign Office could have kept the right hon. Gentleman in such a state of darkness. The British Consul in his despatch stated that he had reason to believe that great atrocities were being committed, and he said, in answer to an inquiry, that it had been stated by one person 5,000 or 6,000 people had been murdered; another said not 5,000 or 6,000, but 25,000 or 26,000 would be nearer the truth. That the atrocities of the Circassians and Bashi Bazouks were committed with the full knowledge of the Turkish Government was evident from a letter which he had received from an American missionary in Bulgaria. The writer, who had every opportunity of obtaining correc information, said—

> "It has been stated that the Turkish Government was forced to employ Circassians and Bashi Bazouks. This is entirely false. There were thousands of the best troops of the Turkish Army at Constantinople who might have been sent by railway in 24 hours to the scene of the revolt. Why were they not sent? The simple truth is that the late War Minister was determined to strike terror into the hearts of the Bulgarian people; hence the employment of the Circassians and Bashi Bazouks."

Now, as in 1853, there was an evident desire in some quarters to magnify the resources and position of Turkey and to depreciate those of Russia. But what was the true state of things? Turkey was relapsing into barbarism, for she had receded rather than advanced since 1853. Corruption, oppression, and the Sultan had reigned conjointly; commerce had greatly diminished, in our case to the amount of 25 per cent, and the country was in a deplorable condition. She had a nominal debt of £156,000,000, of which she had received £86,000,000, and which represented on the Stock Exchange a value of only £18,150,000. It was true that her creditors had lost but little for they got back a considerable sum in the shape of extremely high interest. Taking into account all the interest above 4 per cent, they had been re-imbursed to the amount of about £25,000,000. But there still remained £61,000,000 which Turkey had received, and for this she had almost nothing to show—no public works, no railways, nothing, in short, of a useful public character. Russia, on the other hand, had progressed. Our trade with her was increasing rapidly. Her Debt was £159,000,000. Of this she had received £131,000,000, the value of which on the Stock Exchange was nearly £135,000,000, and for every £10,000 of money borrowed she had a mile of railway to show, independently of other improvements which she had effected. With respect to those railways, he denied they had been created for military purposes alone, and contended that they were to a considerable extent the result of the commercial progress of the country, and it should not be forgotten she had given freedom 10 years ago to 22,000,000 of serfs. All this went to prove that the relative condition of Russia and Turkey now was very different from what it was at the time of the Crimean War. As a solution of the present difficulty it had been suggested that with regard to the future of Turkey a belt of free States should be created, including Roumania, Herzegovina, Bosnia, Servia, and Montenegro, all lying to the north of that country, and he thought the suggestion a good one, and the present a favourable moment for carrying it into effect; but if it was to be carried into effect at all, it would be absolutely necessary to include Bulgaria. It was there that the conflict of race and religion was keenest, and unless it were brought within the circle of free States they were only wasting their time and labour. It was said we ought to support Turkey on account of our position in India; but what did we gain by supporting that Mahomedan Power 20 years ago? They all knew how soon the Crimean War was followed by the terrible Sepoy Mutiny. He concluded that good Government was the only means by which we could continue to hold India.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, as between the Motion and the Amendment that are before us, and as between the speeches by which that Motion and that Amendment respectively were supported, I must confess that I have very little difficulty in making my choice and giving my preference to the Amendment. I will immediately state the reason, but in the meantime I must make a remark on one at least of the speeches we have heard to-night in support of the Motion. I thought my hon. Friend who made the Motion (Mr. Bruce) advanced upon the whole a very elaborate and ingenious plea on what is termed the Ottoman side of the question. But when I heard the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Seconder of the Motion (Mr. Hanbury), I am bound to confess that my hon. Friend the Mover of it was entirely eclipsed, to a degree which it was hardly possible to estimate. My hon. and learned Friend who proposed the Amendment (Mr. Forsyth), said it was such a speech as might have been made by a Turkish Minister; but I must say that I doubt whether any Turkish Minister would have gone to such a length to demonstrate as he did, from his own point of view, that there was indeed somebody who ought to be put out of Europe, but that it was not the Turkish Power, but those Christians whom he described as so inferior in every personal virtue, as having no grievance except from their own superiors and their own Bishops, and, in fact, as having no cause of complaint whatever in relation to the Ottoman Government. On the showing of the hon. Member, nothing could be more clear or ingenuous than the character of the expulsion that ought to be effected; but with regard to the Motion itself, I wish to point out a strong reason against its adoption. I quite agree with the Mover that while maintaining our full and free liberty of criticism—and if we are not to criticize freely, our discussion is worthless—we ought not to give to this debate the character of one of our own domestic political discussions. I am therefore extremely glad that by the judicious action of the Mover of the Motion those words which had a tendency of that kind were removed, and also that the Government with, I think, very good judgment, are understood to have favoured that removal. But when I read the Motion I find that when it indicates a view—I know not whether it be peculiar to himself, but—which I cannot think is the general view of this House, especially when I interpret it by the speech which he delivered. He desires that—

> "Her Majesty's Government, while maintaining the respect due to existing Treaties, should exercise all their influence with the view of securing the common welfare and equal treatment of the various races and religions which are under the authority of the Sublime Porte."

And the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth confirms me in the belief—in fact, conveys to me the knowledge—that I construe these words with accuracy, when I say they were intended to convey the opinion that it would be wrong, under the circumstances of the present war in Europe, to seek for a remedy that shall be applicable to these Provinces in particular, but that what we ought to launch in lieu of that method of proceeding is some plan which, applying to the whole of the Ottoman Empire, will establish the common welfare and equal treatment of all its populations. I hardly think the House will be disposed to give expression to that opinion. I can perfectly well understand the benevolent anxiety that whatever is done for practical reform in Turkey shall be done in such a way as to have at least the capacity of providing for the whole of the various populations of the Ottoman Empire. But I cannot possibly understand that it would be right for us, as a branch of the British Legislature, at a time when a conflagration has begun to arise, which becomes more and more dangerous the longer it continues, and which may at any moment widen its range, to decline to send out the fire engine to put out that conflagration, until we have ascertained that every other dwelling in the Turkish Empire has been made fire-proof. That I take to be a familiar and homely, but the true method of representing the case. On that account, therefore, I hope the House will refuse to commit itself to any such opinion. Under the terms of the Amendment, I am not at all aware that the matter is likely to be decided by a division; but I find there the declaration that effectual guarantees are to be taken according to the sense of the Amendment, and especially with reference to the Slavonic Provinces for good and impartial government, irrespective of race or creed. Those appear to me to be well-chosen words. They exclude that unjust, unfounded, and offensive idea that we are here urging a merely religious conflict. We are doing, I apprehend, nothing of the kind. In so far as religion enters into this question it is our duty to consider it primarily and simply as a matter of fact, and as my hon. Friend points out, what we are to seek for are guarantees for good and equal government, and that we are to be guided entirely by the necessities of the case. I hope it will be allowed that I have not shown any undue impatience of late to intrude myself into the discussions of the House. I am reluctant to trouble them on a question where I must necessarily speak at some length, but at the same time I feel that I have a duty specially incumbent on me. And that duty arises because in this House at the present moment I am the only person who has been officially connected with this great question in its historical character, who is responsible for the proceedings connected with the Crimean War, and not only so, but who says now, in a day when the Crimean War is in a very different state of popularity from that which it enjoyed and elicited a quarter of a century ago, that he does not at all shrink from that responsibility. I wish to establish the connection between the subject before us as we have it now and the Crimean War. I shall endeavour to show that it is in the policy and in the results of the Crimean War that were a to seek for the means by which we may be enabled honourably and usefully to play our part in finding an honourable solution of the present question; and I must begin by trying to remove a perfectly intelligible and innocent, but very singular and curious misapprehension which has prevailed. My right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham is not now in his place. On a recent occasion, when, unhappily I did not hear him—I was not in my place—my right hon. Friend (Mr. Bright), anxious that we should not, as it were, tumble accidentally into the muddle of another war, and not unnaturally alarmed by the tone of some of the manifestations that had been made in various portions of the Press, said—I quote him with substantial accuracy—that—"We drifted into a war in 1853, as we were then informed by the Foreign Minister of that date. Don't let us drift into another." Now, this is a very curious and remarkable example of the ease with which an expression perfectly innocent, and not open, as it was used, to any misapprehension at all, has nevertheless, by the force of what I may call mythical accretion, acquired a meaning totally different from that in which it was originally employed. My right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham is not to blame. He says that which we know to be the common belief. The common belief is that Lord Clarendon in his place, being himself the Foreign Minister, did make the declaration that we had drifted into the Crimean War—that is to say, that we had been carried into it without our own free choice by causes over which we had no control, with no distinct view or policy to guide our course, as victims and playthings of mere circumstance. That is the popular belief; and it was expressed by my right hon. Friend. Now, Lord Clarendon never said any such thing. What he said was this—he used the expression, but I have before me the words, which I have taken the pains to find out in *Hansard,* and I do not believe that anybody has ever thought it at all necessary to refer to the original document to find what was his meaning. They will be seen in the 130th volume, page 568, if any one has the curiosity to look for them. On that occasion the Marquess of Clanricarde had raised a debate in the House of Lords with regard to the policy of the Government—that was on the 14th of February, just before the declaration of war,—and Lord Clarendon having explained the views and the policy of the Government said that, having done with the Blue Book, he came now to the question whether we were at peace or at war, for the noble Marquess had wound up his arguments by asking, Are we at peace, or are we at war? Lord Clarendon answered that negotiations had been brought to a close, that diplomatic intercourse between the two countries had been suspended, and that therefore all questions of policy were over and gone by; that the Government still desired peace, but that the means for securing it had passed away from their hands, and in short, he said, "We are drifting towards war." In using that phrase, he did not mean to say that we had not had a policy, or that negotiations had not been entered into, but that the time for negotiations had gone by, and that we had reached a transition period, when we had nothing to do but to await the declaration of war which reached us three days afterwards, and it was under these circumstances that Lord Clarendon used the expression, "We are drifting towards war." I do not wish to beg the question that the policy of the Crimean War was a just or a well-considered one. That is a question upon which at the time there was some difference of opinion. My right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham opposed the policy of the war with admirable consistency, and in that he was supported by his and my equally distinguished Friend the late Mr. Cobden, and they both firmly resisted the Crimean War and the policy of the Crimean War to the end. But what I wish to point out now, even to those who agreed with the right hon. Member for Birmingham and with Mr. Cobden at the time, is that, whatever objection there may have been to that war, we ought not to ignore or disown the consequences of that war, because it has given us the means and has imposed obligations out of which we can extract valuable rules and principles of conduct that will be most useful to us in the present crisis. What was then the policy of the Government at the time of the Crimean War? It was two-fold. It was intended first, to defend the Turkish Empise against assaults from without, and, secondly, to defend her from corruption and dissolution from within. With regard to our power of defending her from dissolution from within diverse opinions were held. Some were sanguine on the point and some were the reverse. Lord Palmerston hoped for the best, but others did not share his hopes. We all, however, felt the necessity that existed for repelling the external danger, while we all cherished more or less of a hope that much might be effected within the precincts of the Turkish Empire for the purpose of applying a remedy to evils which were then felt, as they are now felt, to be gross and intolerable. We, therefore, felt it to be our duty on the one hand to repel all external danger and on the other to meet as far as we could the no less formidable and dangerous disease from within. These were the principles, as was explained by Lord Palmerston with very great force in the very able and lucid speech in discussing the Treaty of Peace in 1856, which the Government of that day had in view in entering upon the Crimean War. There were four points that suggested that line of operation. The first related to the navigation of the Danube, over which Russia was thought at the time to have a dangerous control; the second had reference to the condition of the Black Sea and to the position of Sebastopol, which was then deemed, and was justly deemed, to be a standing menace to Turkey under the circumstances that then existed; the third related to the Principalities, which were under the special protection of Russia—for which special protection the Treaty of Paris in 1856 substituted a collective guarantee of the Powers, completely and carefully effacing all the special rights of Russia in respect thereof; and the fourth and by far the most important of all referred to the power, which was placed by Treaty in the hands of Russia, which gave her the right of her disturbing the States of the East under the pretence of protecting the Christian subjects of the Porte. By the Treaties that had been entered into, as well as by usage, Russia was thus constituted the champion of Christianity in Turkey, and she had the power of affixing her own construction upon the privileges accorded to the Christian subjects of the Porte, and it was open to her at any moment which she thought fit to select, to say — "Now is the time for me to point out that you are misusing the Christians in that particular place or circumstance. I call upon you to alter your conduct, or else I menace you with the threat of war." That was the state of things before the Crimean War, and Lord Palmerston in the speech to which I refer pointed out conclusively that the cause of the war grew directly out of that state of things. By the famous mission of Prince Menschikoff the demand of Russia was that her rights of interference with the internal affairs of Turkey should be rendered clearer, more defined, and stronger, and she manifested no intention of contracting or of receding from those rights. I will now refer shortly to the results of that war. In the meantime, however, let me entreat the House to consider the risks that we run from imprudent and thoughtless language being used with regard to Russia. Let us consider, in the first place, the enormous difference in the position of the Russia of 1853 and of the Russia of 1876. The Russia of 1853 was in the possession of her full and unbroken resources. By the Crimean War those resources in men, in money, and in credit, as well as in reputation, were so far impaired that in some respects even now, after 20 years of peace, Russia is not where she stood in 1853. In 1853, partly through the wars then recent between Austria and Hungary, she had attained the height of military glory. That is not now the condition of Russia. Although she offered throughout the Crimean War a most gallant resistance, and could not be said in the course of it to have lost military credit, her position in Europe since that war has not been what it was before it, and she does not hold that towering position which she appeared to hold at that period. On the contrary, she is now involved in military burdens and responsibilities with regard to wild and barbarous tribes, which she has thought it her duty, or has found it necessary, to subjugate or contend with in Central Asia, and although it may have been thought by those whom I believe to be light-minded politicians in this country, that her conflicts with those tribes have increased her military strength, yet in the opinion of others those operations have entailed upon her immense burdens, and are among the many causes which now lead her to direct her attention to a more pacific policy in Europe. As I said before, previously to the Crimean War the military supremacy of Russia was acknowledged generally throughout Europe, but her supremacy was not only military, but political also. Of the five great Powers of Europe, Prussia was one; and the Prussia of that day was very different from the Germany of to-day. Prussia was then under Russian influence, and could not be calculated upon for any purpose that was at variance with her views on any subject. Austria, the second of the great Powers, although not under Russian influence to as large an extent as Prussia, had received such obligations from Russia in the shape of military assistance in her conflict with Hungary very shortly before, that it was no unreasonable expectation on the part of Russia, though it was not afterwards realized, that upon Austria to a considerable extent the Emperor of the day might count as not being an opponent to him in any plans he might have formed regarding the East. Above all, I cannot refuse to consider what the character of the Ruler of Russia was at the time and what it is now. He was a man of remarkable ability and of ambition corresponding with the range and scope of that ability. The ruling Sovereign of Russia now is a man who is possessed of an ambition of a wholly different character. He has already signalized his reign by a deed of a pacific character that is almost unequalled in history, especially in a country that is subject to a despotic Ruler. I mean the emancipation of the serfs, which has already won for him a far better, surer, and stronger title to immortality than any that the Emperor Nicholas could have enjoyed, even had he succeeded in planting the Russian flags upon the minarets of Constantinople. That is the difference between the Russia of to-day and the Russia of 1853. It not only surprises but it grieves me when I still find that there is a disposition in some quarters to attempt to set up the old Russian bugbear, and to conjure up from the deep a sort of phantasmagorial existence, and to threaten us with dangers that either do not exist, or are, at all events, indefinite and remote, and to use them not merely for the purpose of terrifying the imagination, but, unfortunately, to excite and inflame the passions of the people. It is in consequence of that feeling that we have articles full of defiance to Russia, in which we are urged to obtain diplomatic successes over her, and some of which go to the extent of rejoicing that we have made a military demonstration against her. What is the meaning and effect of all this? It is that you who do these things are playing into the hands of Russia very effectually. The true friends of Russia are those who convey to the minds of the Christian populations of the Turkish Provinces the belief that Russia is their friend and champion. A great change has taken place in this respect. Before 1853 Russia was presumed to be the habitual champion of the whole of the Eastern Church irrespective of race, and I think I gathered from the speech of my hon. Friend the Mover of the Resolution that Russia was still believed to be the hereditary champion of all the Eastern Churches. There cannot be a greater mistake. Russia is at present in sharp antagonism of feeling with all that portion of the Eastern Christians who belong to the Hellenic Church. The sharp and serious antagonism between the Hellenic and Slavonic portion of the Eastern Churches is not a mere religious and theological antagonism, or an antagonism remotely connected with ecclesiastical organization, but an antagonism which is material, and which affects the feelings of the Hellenic Christians towards the Slavonic element. When you read in the newspapers about tranquillity in Thessaly and Macedonia, and the apparent little disposition of Greece to mix in this quarrel, and about the volunteers of Greece to serve in this army and make contributions for carrying on the war—though I reserve to myself the liberty of retrenching considerably some of these statements—the fact is that these are the indications of the circumstances that the position of Russia with reference to the Christians of Greece has materially changed. If Russia is again to occupy the place she occupied in the minds of Christians of the East before the Crimean War, it will be the fault of those in this country who make speeches such as convey to the minds of Eastern Christendom that we are the enemies of Christendom. After all, I want to know with which of these parties does the future condition of things lie? On the side of which of them is that great and powerful factor, the element of time? I should like to know whether the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tamworth, in his optimizing disposition, will undertake to assure us of this—that the Mahomedans, strong in that panoply of virtue with which he invests them, are growing in power, in wealth, in influence, in knowledge, in population; whether when you go into a Mahomedan village you can tell by the state of its cultivation that it is superior to a Christian village; whether the native and inborn strength of the village is making way against the Christian power, or whether the direct reverse is the case. Unfortunately the statistics for the Turkish Empire are very imperfect, but I apprehend there is not the smallest doubt that the Mahomedans of these Provinces are a dwindling race and likewise a backward race; that there is no element of progress among them; that industry among them is low; that the old traditions of force and ruling by force tends to depress peaceful pursuits; that arts do not flourish among them; that skilled labour exists to no extent among them; that the difference in these respects is easily traceable between a Christian district and a Mahomedan one; and that the advance, such as it is, is a Christian, and not a Mahomedan advance. The hon. Mover appears so happy in that palace of fancy which he has reared for himself that I will not disturb him in it; but I do not think even he would deny that the Mahomedan is a dwindling race. [An hon. MEMBER: They are subject to the conscription.] Surely the hon. Member does not pretend that "the conscription" would, during the 20 years Turkey has been at peace, account for the Mahomedan being a dwindling race? So much for the position of Russia; and now I ask what is the position of the other Powers to whom duty allies us in the consideration of this question? I will take the three together—Germany, Italy, and France—for there is no great difference between them. I hope the hon. Mover has before now discovered that the interruption I addressed to him was not a gratuitous interruption. He said that Austria had objected to the autonomy of Bosnia and Herzegovina. I asked him for the reference, and he gave it to No. 517 at page 350 of these Papers. But he fell into a total and absolute mistake. He mistook a communication to the German Government for a communication from the German Government. No doubt a very pardonable mistake when hastily endeavouring to master the contents of this large volume. Those who wish to refer to it will see that the letter of Mr. Macdonell to Lord Derby is simply a communication of the views of Austria to the German Government. With regard to Germany, Italy, and France, I have not a word to object to what they have said or done in this matter. On the contrary, I consider especially that the Government of France in their communications have been prompted by admirable good sense, and that they have addressed themselves throughout to the maintenance of that which I take to be the most important by far of all the elements in this question—namely, the principle of the common concert of Europe. The position of Austria is undoubtedly in some respects a false position in regard to this question—in this, that she has internal domestic interests of her own, which tend to incline her to take a particular view of the internal affairs of the Turkish Empire, which really do not depend so much on the exigencies of the Turkish Empire as upon her own affairs. I have heard of the dreadful oppression which the Slavs in Hungary are suffering from Austria. I believe these statements to be conceived in a spirit of exaggeration. There is, undoubtedly, a jealousy between the Magyars and the Slavs, and a most important influence that jealousy has upon the conduct and policy of Austria. I am bound to say I do not think we have any cause of complaint against either Austria or Russia in this matter. I am convinced—and these Papers bring out the proof so far as they go—that both these Powers, like the three other Powers, have been labouring honestly and assiduously for the peaceful settlement of these questions. What their ulterior views may be we have no means of knowing. Selfish interests may enter into their views, and if we were placed locally as they are with reference to Turkey, I am afraid we should have some selfish interests attributed to us also. But at the present moment we can see that they know that their palpable interest is, if possible, to adjourn this dangerous crisis—not for ever, but as long as may be—to adjourn it, we may be sanguine enough to hope for a time worth having, such as has elapsed since the Crimean War; but there is no doubt whatever that the Magyar jealousy of the Slav influence in Austria is of such a character that now the Magyar influence is dominant in that Empire, it extends itself legitimately beyond the Empire of Austria, and leads to favour this conclusion, that the internal wants of certain Provinces of the Turkish Empire are not to be met and satisfied, for fear the effect of such satisfaction should be to give additional strength to the Slav influence, not only in, but beyond the Turkish Empire. Therefore it is undoubtedly our duty to watch the proceedings of Austria with reference to the bias which she must needs receive from the existence of a force like that influencing her mind in one direction. Her arguments against autonomy were for this reason not those of an impartial Power. That, then, is the position of the Powers with whom we may be called upon to co-operate. Lord Palmerston at the close of the Crimean War stated with satisfaction, I may say with exultation, that the object of the war had been attained. The military audacity of Russia had been repressed. A very severe blow had been inflicted upon her in the diminution of her resources. The Danube had been freed, Sebastopol had been destroyed, and a provision had even been made—not one of a permanent character, perhaps, and one that has now disappeared—for limiting the force of Russia in the Black Sea. But much more than that; the whole Treaty-rights of Russia to interfere in Turkey had been destroyed. Let us recollect in what position this fact places us relatively to the Christians of Turkey. Remember that, for a generation before the Crimean War, the Christians of Turkey having a protector, the Crimean War abolished the functions of that protector, and do you suppose it was the view of Lord Palmerston, Lord Aberdeen, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and any of those principally concerned in making the Crimean War, that the effect of that war was to leave the Christians of Turkey in a worse position than it found them, and to deprive them of the guardianship which they before enjoyed. No such thing, Sir. That which it did was not to take away from the one Power the right to require a redress for grievances on behalf of Turkey. It was to substitute a European conscience, expressed by collective guarantee and the concerted and general action of the European Powers for the sole and individual action of one of them. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of that principle; and I heartily concur with my hon. Friend who made the Motion in the remarks he made, which I believe lie at the root of the whole matter. Therefore I think the boast of Lord Palmerston with regard to the condition of the Christians of Turkey was sustained by the facts when he was able to point to that which actually occurred—that we had destroyed that dangerous prerogative of Russia which had been made use of in the hands of Nicholas as a means of destroying the peace of Europe, and we had substituted for that the new arrangement referred to in the Treaty of 1856, and recited there, under which the principles of civil equality were guaranteed to the Christians. Well, Sir, it may be said, and said truly, that in that Treaty there is an article which recites that the new legislation on behalf of the Christians in the Turkish Empire is an act of grace and of favour on the part of the Sultan, and it is likewise distinctly stated in that Treaty that out of the communication of this new legislation there shall not arise any right of interference in the internal affairs of the Turkish Empire, either separate or collective. Of that there is no doubt; and that was noticed in the debates in this House. Lord Palmerston was told that the provision on behalf of the Christians was really little better than waste paper, because you renounced any right of interference which might grow out of a communication made by the Sultan. Of course, it was open to state that, although we renounced the right of interference arising out of the communication, we did not renounce the right of interference which upon general grounds and general principles might well be held to apply to the Powers of Europe. But Lord Palmerston was not satisfied, and he lays down this doctrine, as reported in the 142nd volume of *Hansard*, pages 125-6—

> "The Sultan, however, was perfectly willing to give to the Allies that sort of moral right which I think ought to be considered a sufficient security for the maintenance of the arrangements which were made, and which in themselves were satisfactory. . . . Cases will arise in which the firman will not be fully executed by the authorities of the Porte in distant provinces and in places not immediately under the view of the Consuls; and if that should occur the fact of the firman having been adverted to in the Treaty would give to the Allied Powers the moral right of diplomatic interference and of remonstrance with the Sultan, which I am perfectly convinced would be quite sufficient to accomplish the desired purpose. . . . . The stipulation contained in this treaty will give to all the Powers the right of watching whether the firman is carried into effect, and of remonstrating in case of violation of it."

That laid down that one great result of the Crimean War was the establishment of the great principle of European concert as against that of the individual action and sole interference; and I now lay down that a second great result of the Crimean War was that, in the words of Lord Palmerston, a moral right of interference was acquired, not in petty details, not upon arbitrary and separate issues, but upon the great, broad, general question whether the engagements which Turkey then solemnly took in the face of the world to redress the evils and abuses of her Government and to extend to all her subjects the blessings of civil and religious freedom have been fulfilled or whether they have not. These were great results, and if we did go to war, and if we did expend and suffer much in treasure and in life, yet by these consequences of the war foundations were laid that promised the maintenance, at least for a considerable time, of tranquillity in the East, and principles were established and sanctioned, under the shield and cover of which we have the power, moral as well as physical, to do all that the case requires. I have stated what are the attitude and condition of other countries; it is necessary to say something about the attitude and condition of Turkey herself. I am not about to accuse Turkey of iniquity; I do not believe that dishonourable intention has been at the bottom of these failures. We have had an experience of more than 20 years—of 20 years of such tranquillity as I do not believe, in the course of its troubled annals, the Turkish Empire ever had enjoyed. What has been the result and fruit of those 20 in respect to internal reform, in respect to the repression and cure of those tremendous mischiefs, which were recognized at the time of the Crimean War, recognized by none more clearly than by those who were most anxious to repel the aggressions of Russia—such men as Lord Palmerston and Lord Stratford de Redcliffe — Lord Palmerston, who has been taken from us in a distinguished old age, and Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, who still lives, at an age still more advanced, to give the weight of his authority to principles then laid down as those of a sound and enlightened policy? I ask the question, then, have these Turkish engagements been fulfilled or have they not? If not, it is not, in my opinion, iniquity—I am afraid I must say it is impotence: a moral blight seems to have rested on every large or effective scheme of improvement. The principles of civil society as they are understood in Europe are not understood in Turkey, are not embraced in the Ottoman faith. Particular concessions may be made, and particular evils may be mitigated; men of ability and enlightened views may rise from time to time, such as Fuad Pasha and Mehemet Ali; but you have no security for the succession of such men; you have no tradition of their continuance. They are not like the men in that race of the Greeks, in which he who carried the light, when he had achieved his course, handed it on to the one who ran next; they are more like the aloe, which flowers only once in a long period of years, or the Phœnix, which never exists. It would take time, otherwise it would not be difficult to go through long details founded, not upon arbitrary individual opinions, but upon the pages of this Blue Book—upon particulars carefully and faithfully selected from these pages to show what are the causes of this failure; but I will satisfy myself almost exclusively by quoting the words of Lord Derby. On the 13th of June, in a despatch on Page 253 of the Papers numbered 3, he sums up the case in these words:—

> "It is undeniable that the liberal and enlightened projects of reforms which have from time to time been promulgated at Constantinople, have not been brought into practical operation in the Provinces."

What can we say of such testimony as this? Can we add to it: can we detract from it? If there has been a prepossession in the proceedings of the present

Government, it has not been one adverse to the Ottoman Porte, and yet Lord Derby sums up the case in that broad and equivocal declaration, that the projects of reforms of the Turkish Government have not been carried into practical operation in the Provinces. I hardly know whether any other authority can be required. One word, however, I will say on the authority of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe. Everyone who hears me is aware of the great ability of this distinguished statesman and diplomatist. Everyone knows that if there has been one point more marked than another in the career of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe it was a certain antagonism to Russian influence. Partly in consequence of that antagonism, and partly in consequence of his patriotic sentiments—and no doubt from the latter in the main, he was one of the leading men who maintained in all its firmness and force the policy pursued in 1853. His strong hand was that which held up high before the Ottoman Porte all the symbols of that policy. You have heard his witness of late years; in this year you have seen, with no sign of weakness from his age, but with a vigour worthy of his best time, he has recorded his sorrowful conviction that these promises have remained unfulfilled, and that a new necessity has arisen for adopting new measures in order to attain those ends for the attainment of which these promises were given and exacted. Is it necessary to refer to the number of indications we have in these very remarkable and most interesting Papers, in which, as far as I can judge, there has apparently been no suppression, but a liberal communication of the information at the command of the Government? Although they unfortunately came late into our hands, they afford the fullest proofs of the utterly unsatisfactory state of things at the present moment, and almost at more points than I care to number I find clear indications of that mournful state of things. Such is the defect of sound original principles and notions of government in Turkey, and such the tendency to abuses in human nature—such is our wilful self-delusion when we shut our eyes to facts—that there is no principle of health-like vigour at Constantinople necessary to propel the orders of the Turkish Government through the Provinces. Let us take as an instance what has happened lately. A set of promises are given, and after they are given, it is not considered necessary to fulfil them to-day. They are put off until to-morrow or the day after, or the next day, and, in the meantime, those whose self-interests are concerned begin to devise impediments and obstructions. A pressure of business arises in other quarters, and as the stages of delay are multiplied, the reasons for fresh delay are always forthcoming. So it goes on until some great difficulty arises, such as the rebellion in the Herzegovina. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister sagaciously remarked at the Lord Mayor's dinner last year at the Mansion House, that this rebellion acquired a more formidable character, because it was combined with what was understood to be an act of repudiation. And what happened then? Simply, that which has always happened when a crisis of the kind has arisen—namely, the issue of a new document, with a new set of promises, and a new recital of the daily, sleepless care of the reigning Sultan and his Government as to the performance of the duties of civilized society and the establishment of perfect and absolute equality among his subjects. And these promises, which are so much wind—for they have not the solidity of paper, they are so much breath—issue into the air and mix with other currents. And it is supposed that upon this we are to rely, without reflecting that we have had the same thing over and over and over again. To these promises we have entrusted the happiness of millions, and to these promises the interests and welfare of millions of the people of Turkey have been sacrificed. I contend that to these promises there must be an end, and if sensible to the obligations of duty and honour, and looking back a quarter of a century ago to the rights we then acquired and the obligations we then came under, we ought to insist that there should be some reality in the guarantees —if with guarantees we are to be content —given by the Turkish Government. We must make sure in one way or the other that this terrible state of things is not to be indefinite. Something has been said about the great difficulty of putting down the present revolt in consequence of the fact that the refugees did not return to their homes. Certainly, very few did return. The terror of the Insurgents may have kept back some from returning, but was that the only cause? Have hon. Members read the account of the massacre of 12 Christian refugees who were returning to their homes last October in consequence of the invitation of the Turkish Government? If you have not read it, it is time you did, before you attempt to weigh the causes that kept the refugees from returning. It is not in the Blue Book last presented to the House, but in that which was presented four months ago, and which had reference to the period anterior to the Andrassy Note. It is not simply the fact that the 12 refugees were murdered. That would be sad enough by itself, but under what circumstances were they murdered and what were the consequences of the transaction and the redress they have obtained? Those refugees came back on the invitation of the Ottoman Government, and under the protection of the regular Turkish troops. On arriving they were murdered by the Aghas and the Turkish troops looked on in silence at the transaction. Is it possible for the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tamworth (Mr. Hanbury) to hear this recital, and have no misgiving about the pictures he has drawn to-night? What followed? Was this covered up for weeks together, as were the Bulgarian atrocities, by some devices which I have difficulty in describing? No, it became known in Constantinople, and Sir Henry Elliot discharged his duties, as he always does, in the spirit of an honourable and enlightened Christian diplomatist. He at once sent and informed the Grand Vizier, who shared his indignation and promised redress. Sir Henry Elliot reported the interview with the Grand Vizier on the 26th of October. On the 23rd of November Sir Henry Elliot wrote to Downing Street to say that nothing whatever had been done; and from the 23rd of November, 1875, to the 31st of July, 1876, that outrage remains unredressed. What can you expect from a system under which these things take place? Let me give you another instance in which the Mahomedans were the sufferers, and I will quote now from the Salonica Papers. After the population of Salonica had become sufficiently calm to allow judicial proceeding connected with the murder of the two Consuls to begin, a Court assembled on the spot. The criminal justice of the Turkish Empire was put in motion, and the delegates of the chief European Powers attended the Court and watched the proceedings. Punishment was inflicted on three leading persons. The first was the colonel of the garrison and chief of the police. He was degraded from his military rank and sentenced to one year's imprisonment. The second was the commander of the garrison, who was sentenced to 45 days' imprisonment. The third was the commander of the corvette, and he was also sentenced to 45 days' imprisonment. The delegates were not satisfied with these sentences, and they admonished the Porte—rather a singular proceeding—that they were not sufficiently severe. However, they had been passed, and the punishment had been inflicted, and I suppose those upon whom they had been passed had a moral title to presume that, as they had gone through their trial and received judgment, the matter was at an end. And so it would have been among European nations, and according to European ideas of justice. It was, however, not so according to Ottoman ideas. The German Government—which is somewhat prompt and decisive in the views it takes upon these matters—was not satisfied with these sentences, but it appeared that the matter could quite easily be settled. True, they had gone through a course of criminal jurisdiction once, but there was no reason why they should not undergo it again. The venue was accordingly changed, and a Court met in Constantinople. The gentleman who was condemned to one year's imprisonment now got, in addition to degradation, 15 years' with hard labour. The gentleman the commander of the garrison, who got 45 days' imprisonment, was sentenced to three years in a fortress, and the commander of the corvette, who also got 45 days at the first trial, was turned down from his rank and received 10 years' imprisonment. Now, that is the mode of administering criminal justice under political pressure in the Turkish Empire through its Ottoman rulers towards its Mahomedan subjects. I am one of those who greatly desire to maintain the territorial integrity of the Turkish Empire, but as to setting up the notion of independence in the exact sense in which it applies to great and highly-civilized

European communities, it is perfectly plain that any such notion could find no more than a partial application in Turkey. The state of things in Bosnia and Herzegovina was very bad. Unfortunately, the Ottoman Government, when it makes one step forward, is rather giving to taking two steps backward. Certain things have been done under the Firman of 1856; but since then a new set of mischiefs of a fiscal and financial character have come into operation, and they appear to weigh upon Christians and Mahomedans very nearly alike. The amount of tithes has been increased, and the system of realizing money by a sale of tithe-farming was in force in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1875. Upon the breaking out of the rebellion there came immediately the usual crop of promises, and among them was the promise that the system of farming the tithes should be given up, and that the tithes should be collected directly by the officers of the Government. A decree was issued accordingly, but so mutable are the decrees of the central power that this very year, and while the rebellion was going on, the decree was recalled, and the system of tithe farming was re-established. I grant that since then another change has taken place. In June that revocation was re-revoked, and it was again ordered that the tithes should be collected by the Government. But what security have we that another may not be added to the many revocations, and that when the pressure is a little relaxed, the tax farmer, whether Christian or Mahomedan, it does not matter which, may not be re-instated in all his glory? These are a small number of instances out of many which might be given, but I fall back upon the declaration of Lord Derby, that the liberal and enlightened reforms which had been agreed to at Constantinople had not been carried into practical operation. My hon. Friend the Mover of the Resolution referred to the fact that in Bosnia and Herzegovina the evidence of a Christian would not be taken in Court against that of a Mahomedan, and he added that still there was very little difference between the condition of the Christian and the Mahomedan. Well, my hon. Friend is a man upon whom in all circumstances of social life I would place the utmost reliance, and probably he would not be indisposed to entertain a somewhat similar feeling towards myself, but if I could take him into Court and give evidence against him, he not being able to give evidence on his own behalf, I do not think he would feel altogether comfortable, or be inclined to accede to the proposition that there was very little difference in our relative position. Well, Sir, I have come to the conclusion that the administration of its insurgent Provinces on the old footing is a task which, unless we are disposed to close our eyes to the light of day, we must now at length, however reluctantly, admit the Porte is incompetent to fulfil, and that the real question—the real remaining question—is not whether the supremacy of the Porte can be established in its ancient form as a supremacy of administration, but whether its political supremacy in some improved form can be—as I hope it may be—still maintained. It is said that these revolts are maintained by foreign instigation, and that is the uniform burden of the song when these cases occur. It is always the foreigner who does it. It was the same in Italy. It was said there that it was not the Italians, but the Piedmontese; Italy was persuaded that it was well governed; but it was the Piedmontese that induced them to go to war. What a strange thing however, is this—that since Italy has been united, perfect peace has prevailed over Italy. A most singular result this of that action of foreign instigation. I admit that in this case there has been, and there is, a great deal of foreign instigation, but it is not the instigation of States. That is, I think, perfectly clear upon the face of it. It comes in a great degree from Russian committees, but they are entirely a reflex of popular opinion. It comes from Montenegro; but a little Sovereign—I might almost say a trumpery Sovereign, if measured by the extent of his dominions — cannot possibly restrain the ardent sympathies of his people. It is not from Servia that the sympathies come, it is from Dalmatia. Dalmatia has been a great source of support and a sure harbour of refuge, and Dalmatia is Austrian, and none of you suspect Austria of a disposition to support these insurrections. If it were an insurrection of States you might interfere, you might remonstrate against it. It is, however, popular sympathy—an influence, as it were, passing through the air—an influence working in detail in a way which you cannot detect or effectually check. Foreign instigation has no doubt done much to sustain the revolts; you may regret it, but you cannot prevent it, and it is idle to refuse to recognize the distinction between the strong, irrepressible popular sympathy flowing in on every side and the mere intrigues and action of States. And now, Sir, I must reluctantly state, with the exercise of that right of criticism which we all possess, the points on which I am not satisfied with the action of Her Majesty's Government. I think, with the hon. Gentleman the Mover of the Resolution, that Her Majesty's Government committed a very serious error at the period preceding the formation of the Andrassy Note, and at the time of the first Consular intervention, in allowing what I may call the initiative of concert and intervention to pass from their hands. I agree with my hon. Friend that the Three Great Northern Powers, whom we all desire to see living in concert, had no right to form themselves into an entity and take the initiative out of the joint hands of the Powers of Europe. I am sorry to say that in my opinion the error to which I have referred has been the source of most of the difficulties and inconveniences that have since been experienced. I look upon the concert of Europe as the greatest of all the results achieved by the Crimean War, as thus Europe speaks unitedly, and in a way that cannot be resisted; but as soon as three Powers are separated from the other three, factions arise which have a fatal effect upon the securing of concert in action, and encouragement is given to the resistance of wise counsels, and that without the slightest countervailing advantage. It may be my prejudice, but I am sorry to say I sometimes think I can divine the reason why you did not do what Lord Hammond said—namely, vigorously remonstrate and protest against the separate initiative of the Three Empires. Most certainly we ought to have made that remonstrance. Perhaps we did make it. If we did, Her Majesty's Government might have been told, "You are not at all indisposed to sole action when it suits your purpose, as in the case of the purchase of the Suez Canal Shares, when, without consulting anybody, you placed yourselves very much in the position of a private company. This is a very important change in the position of the Porte for which hitherto you have proclaimed an absolute supremacy over the claims of the Suez Canal, and you do not come into Court with clean hands to protest against the partial action of the Three Powers." However that may be, on the thing itself I place the greatest reliance. I think you have most unwisely abandoned and surrendered that principle of the concert of Europe which I hope henceforward you will do your utmost to re-establish. By the concert of Europe you may succeed in restoring tranquillity; without it you never can. You may take a side and you may stimulate passion in connection with any question; you may do much to disturb a subject that is sufficiently disturbed and embroiled already; but if your object is to compose and settle it you must beat back upon the course in which you have been engaged, and instead of the system of sole action, you must return to the policy established by the Crimean War, and endeavour, whatever you do, to do it in concert with the Great Powers. The Government have weakened their own hands by forgetting—for it must have been forgetfulness—that their position in regard to Turkey is not merely that of friends entitled to give friendly advice, but is likewise that of one who has acquired what Lord Palmerston called the moral right of offering remonstrance. These reforms, concerning which Lord Derby has written so admirably in his despatches, were not mere independent legislation on the part of the Sultan, but they were covenants entered into between the Sultan and his subjects, and for which the Powers of Europe were made morally responsible, and I therefore hold that it was an entire mistake on the part of Her Majesty's Government when, after adopting the Andrassy Note, they refused to join the Powers in pressing its acceptance on the Porte, with the remark that they could not go beyond the tendering of friendly advice on the subject. If you confine yourself to this you may tender friendly advice until the crack of doom. It is only by the weight of authority, and that alone, that can gain the objects that are to be had in view. If you ask Lord Stratford de Redcliffe what kind of friendly advice he tendered to the Porte, what it was that gave him so much influence with the Ottoman Government, and enabled him to do so much good in the way of redressing grievances, he will give you a lesson that you will find useful. I agree with much of what was said by the hon. Gentleman the Seconder of the Amendment in regard to the despatch of the fleet to Besika Bay. It now seems that the fleet were so despatched as a measure of defence, upon the request of our Ambassador, who acted in strict concert with all the other Ambassadors in Constantinople. Notwithstanding this, it has pleased some of the public instructors in this country to construe that despatch as a measure of demonstration and of menace; and so far from Her Majesty's Government correcting that impression, they allowed that operation to bear the erroneous construction which had been placed upon it. The right hon. Gentleman sat still in his place and listened to compliments based upon that interpretation of the proceeding, and a similar circumstance occurred in the other House. My noble Friend the Leader of the Opposition put a Question in which he made a rather marked reference to the despatch of the Fleet, and the right hon. Gentleman in replying to him did nothing to remove the impression to which I have referred. Similar Questions were put in the other House of Parliament, with similar results, and I was certainly surprised to find in the Papers that have been laid before Parliament an official declaration that the critics who had been objecting to this despatch of the Fleet as a demonstration of naval force would have to eat their criticisms, for the reason that the movement was made with a pacific purpose and after concert with those who were supposed to be effected by the menace. It appears to me that this system of double construction is one which deserves notice, criticism, and censure, and I should dwell upon it more at length were it not that I regard this as a question in consequence of its difficulty as affecting the adoption of proper regulations for the future rather than one calling for the establishment of objections to what has been done in the past. Finally, although I know the action of the Government in respecting the Berlin Memorandum has met with a great deal of approbation, I do not hesitate to express my concurrence with the sentiments of the noble Lord the Member for Calne (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice) in thinking that it was an error to reject the Memorandum, instead of making it the basis of communication with the Powers. What Her Majesty's Government did was to reject the Memorandum and then to recommend the Porte not to reject it, but to make it a subject of detailed investigation. Supposing the advice to have been as sound as it was inconsistent with their own action, why did Her Majesty's Government not give their aid to the Porte in making the investigation? The letters on the subject of the Memorandum which appear among these despatches are just such letters as might have been written by some very able leading counsel engaged to say everything that could be said against the document. Objections are taken which the Ottoman Government disowns. The Memorandum required the Porte to find funds for rebuilding the houses of the refugees. It is said here that the Porte could not do that, for she could not find funds, did not possess any, and could not borrow. Yet a few weeks before the Porte very freely takes that very engagement which Lord Derby recommended them not to take, because it was impossible to fulfil. Again, one of the great demands of the Insurgents to which objection is taken by the British Government is that if they return to their country they should return armed. "Oh," said the British Government, "that will not do; that will lead to a collision." They cannot bear the idea of the collision that will arise from these two parties being armed, and therefore they propose that one party which is unarmed shall go into the presence of another which is armed. That is the position of our Government; but what of the Turkish Government? Their proposition is, I must say, a very much more reasonable one, as may be seen from Page 210 of these Papers, in the letter of Sir Henry Elliot to Lord Derby of May 9, where it says that—

> "The Porte has never intimated an intention of disarming the Christians, and judging from the language both of Raschid Pasha and of Hussein Avni Pasha, the Minister of War, there will not, I think, be any difficulty in obtaining an assurance that it will not be attempted."

Notwithstanding this, Her Majesty's Government, more Turkish than the Turks, rush into the field, and say this is a thing we cannot hear of, for a collision will be certain to ensue. They, therefore proposed that one side should be disarmed, and that it should then go into the presence of an armed population. Why did they not act in concert and in council, and bring these points upon the carpet one by one? They take another objection, which seems to me to be perfectly good—namely, that the Berlin Note had not provided for what was to take place at the expiration of the period of joint action, and that it was therefore likely to lead to a prolongation of hostilities, but it was clear from the Papers, that in the opinion of the other Powers; there would have been no difficulty in removing that passage from the document. What, then, was the effect of the rejection of the Memorandum? We were told that the effect of its rejection was to produce a very satisfactory feeling of confidence on the part of the Turks and put them in an extremely good humour towards the Christian populations of the Principalities, and, indeed, towards the whole world. But what was the effect upon the people of Servia and Montenegro? Why, that as long as they saw the Powers of Europe at work to procure a pacific solution, it was possible to keep them from resorting to arms; but when you came in and deliberately overthrew the plans proposed, and as deliberately announced that you had no plan of your own, and were prepared to let things take their course, these people, deprived of all reasonable hope, drew the sword from the scabbard, and you see the result in the war which followed. There is another subject into which I will not enter, for I feel that I have already detained the House too long; and it has been touched before, and will probably be touched by others—I mean the cruelties practised in Bulgaria. I will only express a hope that Her Majesty's Government will take care that we have no sham inquiry into them. The accounts I receive inspire me with an apprehension that the person who has been chosen to conduct the inquiry is not well suited for the purpose; that neither his disposition nor his history points him out as in the slightest degree likely to go to the root of the matter. I shall not presume to pronounce a definite judgment; but, after all that has taken place, after all these delays before any considerable proportion of the truth was allowed to come into view in this country, I do hope that the Government will take care that the inquiry shall be a real inquiry, and that those who have incurred so deep a guilt shall be brought to account for it. It may be said—"You have criticized the policy of the Government in these respects. Can you suggest any plan?" My answer is that it would be the greatest presumption on my part to do so. I do not deny the difficulties of the case. I am glad on this account that the question is not made a question of censure in the form of a vote. To a formal approval of the policy of the Government it would be impossible for me to assent, but I am sensible of the great difficulties with which they have had to deal. I have spoken, for example, with an honest and cordial tribute of admiration of the present Emperor of Russia. I am not, however, prepared to say that every servant of the Emperor of Russia in foreign lands—particularly, perhaps, near the seat of these events—commands equal confidence to that which we ought to feel in His Majesty. These are great difficulties for the Government; but it seems to me that, though a plan cannot be suggested, it is not difficult to discern what ought to be the principles of policy which should guide the course of this country. In the first place, I heard with much satisfaction the hon. Gentleman the Mover of the Resolution say that it was impossible again to be satisfied with the mere utterance of a promise; there must be more than that; something added to the promise in order to justify acceptance on our part. Supposing, then, we are agreed that the case is serious and that mere promises cannot be accepted, the next principle is that we must endeavour to obtain European concert. The absence of European concert upon this question will infallibly imply—not, perhaps, at present, but hereafter—the arriving at European convulsion. The choice is between the two. European concert may not succeed. Everything else must fail. What is this concert to be for? I say, without the least hesitation, it must be for measures conceived in the spirit and advancing in the direction of self-government. Autonomy is a word which has acquired a technical sense. I will not undertake to say anything definite, either positive or negative, about it; but this I will say, that the state of the Turkish Empire, the long experience of now half-a-century, show us distinctly that it is in this direction, and in this direction only, that relief is to be had. Nothing else, probably, not even the most miserable measure of relief can be found from any other source. Let the House consider that this is no new case. Consider how the monster structure of the Turkish Empire is dotted all over with instances in which the central Power has been totally unable to discharge the first duties of Government, and in which the cure has been found by bringing in, in various forms, popular and local action. There is the case of the Kingdom of Greece, where, mainly in consequence of the errors of the Turks themselves, this action proceeded to the actual establishment of independence. I need not dwell upon this because I hope it may be possible to stop short of so extreme a result. There is the case of the Lebanon. There you had to deal with a position of extreme difficulty. Yet there the establishment of principles of local administration put an end to the state of things which prevailed some 12 or 15 years ago, and with which the Porte, by the exercise of the central Power, had found itself unequal to deal. There is the island of Samos—I believe I am accurate in the name of the island—tranquil, and comparatively flourishing and happy because it enjoys the privileges of self-government. But, above all, there is the case of Servia itself, where, by the establishment of full local privileges, great relief was given to the Porte and tranquillity to the East. Nor is it Servia which is now the root of these difficulties. Servia has been compelled to come in in a later stage; but it is sympathies flowing from other quarters, and not from Servia, which have caused these troubles. We have also to look at what has been done in Crete. But the case I quote with the utmost confidence is the case of the Principalities. Of all the results of the Crimean War there is none so satisfactory, and, I confess, I remember with some envy that France had a larger share than we had in bringing about this result. The Principalities, when disunited, were much more open to intrigue from without. Their union made them a State of respectable dimensions, secured development from within; and the effect has been, not, perhaps, the establishment of a perfect Government, but, at all events, an immense material and moral development there. Above all, in the view of foreign policy, these very countries, which were the door through which Russia found it convenient to advance into Turkey, have now become a firm military barrier against her. It is sometimes said that the case of the Principalities is different because there are very few Mahomedans there, whereas there are many in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This may be so, but these same gentlemen tell us that it is not a question of religion. I believe in the main they are right; but I think there are various instances which show us that a mere difference of religion, if it stands alone, does not constitute a hopeless difficulty. I believe there is at this moment in the free Kingdom of Greece, in the Island of Eubœa, no inconsiderable number of Mahomedan squires—if I may call them so—or landed proprietors, who live in peace and satisfaction, with their lands cultivated by Christian peasants and under a Christian Government. In the Principalities the land question is one of considerable difficulty. It is true there was no difference of religion, but there was a great difference of proprietary rights, and it led to a sharp conflict. Notwithstanding that, the power of free government has been found perfectly effectual to deal with the difficulty, and most certainly I think that a survey of the whole circuit of Turkish Empire points out to us in the most distinct manner, that it is in the direction of free local government, and in that direction alone, that we can seek a remedy for the present disorder. Now, Sir, I sympathized very much with the right hon. Gentleman the other night when he said he could not, in answer to a Question, deal with the point put to him from below the Gangway on the other side of the House with regard to immediate action. I sympathize, however, with the question as far as regards the object which the hon. Member had in view. Every day lost in this matter, I feel convinced, causes additional risk and hazard. It seems to me to be of the utmost consequence that, if possible, there should be some friendly European action, firm and intelligent in its character, before either of the parties has gained a decisive advantage over the other. I may be wrong, but I see little probability of profit to the Ottoman Power by this war. It appears to me that, in all likelihood, if she should succeed in putting her enemies on the defensive, yet when they are on the defensive she will not be able to subdue them. The power of popular sympathy coming in from every side will be far greater than she can by possibility cope with. On the other hand, should the Servians and the Montenegrins obtain decisive advantages in the field, it will be most difficult to deal with them when they are raised to a height of sanguine expectation and confidence, and possess probably an extended sympathy and support. I, therefore, greatly hope, in the interests of general peace, that it may be found possible to pursue some prompt action with a view to interference in this matter, for I am not ashamed to say that I still desire, if possible, the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the Turkish Empire. I do not see how, if that is broken up, we can avoid very serious difficulties and dangers. On the other hand, I believe that if we can get rid of the difficulties of local administration by a Power which is wholly incompetent to conduct it, especially from Constantinople, we may attain the very practical object of good government. Gentlemen have spoken of the formation of a Southern Slav State, but depend upon it it is much more easily said than done. And if it were established it would be found to raise up a new set of difficulties and dangers. Within these limits, which I have feebly endeavoured to indicate, and to which I think there is no inconsiderable approximation among the various speakers in this House, I most earnestly hope that Her Majesty's Government may be able to discover a solution of this question—a solution which may have the effect of giving us the consolatory assurance that all our efforts and sacrifices made at the time of the Crimean War were not made in vain—a solution which may adjourn, and perhaps adjourn for a long time, the raising of a greater question as to the presence of the Turkish Power in Europe, which we feel to be fraught with serious and grave considerations of uncertainty, and perhaps of danger; and a solution which, above all, may afford to a population that has suffered long and suffered much a hope of gaining at length the benefits of rational government and civilized life.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, I feel considerable difficulty in dealing with the Resolutions which I find on the Paper. If they expressed confidence or involved censure, of course it would not be difficult to deal with them; but at present, although they are numerous, they only express a sentiment, and not a very strong one. I must say I much regret, as censure or confidence has not been proposed, that my hon. Friend or any other hon. Gentleman who thought fit to bring before this House the discussion of this matter should not have moved simply for Papers. If the House of Commons is really to express its opinion on these grave events, I should have wished that there should have been an opinion more decided and expressed in language more commanding; but it is impossible to read these Resolutions without at once seeing that the principle and point of them, as they were originally drawn, have been taken away from them. There was, indeed, one Amendment intended to be proposed by the noble Lord the Member for Calne (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice), which did imply a censure on the Government; nor can I see why it was withdrawn, because we have had a speech from the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down in support of it. It was avowedly a speech of censure against the Government, and coming from such a quarter I think the noble Lord might have taken the opinion of the House upon the subject. I will not enter into the politics of the Crimean War. Having no Resolution which I am called upon to combat, I hold that my principal duty here is not to vindicate—for it has not been attacked except by the right hon. Gentleman—but to explain the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in this matter from the beginning. Perhaps, before I make these remarks, I might notice some which have been made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Holms) on a subject of a most painful character, but which I think ought not to have been introduced into this debate. I mean the atrocities alleged to have been committed in consequence of the invasion of Bulgaria. I think on this occasion it would be quite out of keeping to enter into any controversy on that subject.

Admit that all the Bulgarian atrocities that have been brought under the consideration of the House are genuine, and admit that they have all been committed by one side—and I am not prepared to make either of these admissions—everybody must feel that that is a question completely outside that which we are called upon to consider now, which is really whether the House approves or not—though they may not choose to have a Resolution—of the policy of the Government in the late negotiations. But the hon. Gentleman did make one charge against Her Majesty's Government which I must notice. He said there was printed among these Papers a Report of our Consul respecting these massacres which must have been kept back from me by the Foreign Office. I must vindicate the Foreign Office. Neither my noble Friend the Secretary of State, however, nor myself, considered that Report was one which at all justified the statements which were made, and which were subsequently the subject of discussion in this House. A Consul hears, and no doubt truly, that there has been extremely wild work on the part of some of the Bashi-Bazouks, and he engages some one to go to a coffee-house frequented by these ruffians, where he listens to the reports of the wild work that has been going on. One present says—"5,000 or 6,000 must have perished innocently," when another answers—"If you had said 25,000 or 26,000 you would have been more correct," as if exulting in the carnage. Now we know very well how difficult it is even in civilized nations with a well-organized police to obtain accurate information on such points, and how frequently we hear of 100,000 men being assembled on a public occasion when subsequent inquiry showed that the number was not more than 10,000. I was not justified for a moment to adopt that coffee-house babble brought by an anonymous Bulgarian to a Consul as at all furnishing a basis of belief that the accounts subsequently received had any justification. I will only mention one more circumstance with reference to this subject, which may be one worthy the attention of the House if it chose to consider it singly and apart, but which I think ought to be kept out of a discussion as to the conduct of the Government in these negotiations. I was sorry to hear the right hon. Gentleman opposite speak as he did just now with so much contumely and want of confidence of the person to whom was intrusted the investigation on the spot of these dreadful atrocities that have taken place. I really do not know who the individual is to whom the right hon. Gentleman refers, but I hope he is not an Englishman. [Mr. GLADSTONE: Oh, no!] If it be Mr. Baring—[Mr. GLADSTONE: Oh, dear, no!]—I should be most pained to hear the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman because he possesses the most entire confidence of the Ambassador, and our own confidence as well. I should say that we have already received a despatch from Mr. Baring on this subject, and he has made an investigation with regard to a report which produced a deep impression on this House—namely, the story that we heard about 40 girls being burned. He says that there is not the slightest foundation for that story, and that it is a complete fabrication. The right hon. Gentleman went on to describe with most telling effect, the massacre of some refugees who tried to return to their country; but in the Papers before the House there is an account of the first incident in the insurrection in Herzegovina, and it began in this way. It would seem that the insurrection of Herzegovina began to break out in July, 1875, by a disturbance arising out of the return of some of the inhabitants who had emigrated, from Montenegro. The circumstances are identical with those mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman. The insurgents attacked and captured the caravan, and murdered and beheaded five Turkish travellers. It appears, therefore, that the refugees could defend themselves and massacre the Turks; and this only shows that in those countries there are views and feelings of humanity altogether different from our own, and that on both sides these horrible scenes have been occurring. But at the present moment, although the right hon. Gentleman seems to think that the promises of the Turkish Minister are utterly valueless, and that the influence of Her Majesty's Ambassador is of no avail, I can only say that I believe great exertions are being made to prevent a repetition of any incidents of this kind, and that our interference has been productive of great good. The insurrection, as I have said, commenced in the month of July, 1875, and after some time—in August—the three Imperial Powers made a proposition that there should be a delegation of Consuls from the States, called by courtesy the six Great Powers, to treat with the insurgents. I do not know whether we took a wise step in agreeing to that proposal. We objected to it on principle, and I think Lord Derby addressed a letter to Sir Henry Elliot in which he expressed that opinion of the Government. He said that Her Majesty's Government had since the outbreak of the insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina deprecated diplomatic intervention of the other Powers in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire, but that they agreed to the Consular Commission although they felt little good would result from it. The Government, on the other hand, did not counsel the Porte to resist any advice which they might consider to be advantageous, adding that they could not conceal from themselves the gravity of the situation owing to the weakness exhibited by the Porte in dealing with the insurrection in its early stages, the want of confidence in its administration, and the state of collapse in which its Government had been allowed to fall. The responsibility of that condition of affairs, the despatch from which I am quoting went on to say, must rest with the Sultan and his Government, and all that could be done by Her Majesty's Government was to give such advice as they deemed to be best under the circumstances. That was the feeling by which we were influenced throughout these transactions. After the failure of the Consular Commission the rumour arose that the three Imperial Powers were preparing a Note on the state of Herzegovina, and that was the celebrated Andrassy Note. We did not conceal from the House on a previous occasion that Her Majesty's Government hesitated much before they adopted the Note. The reason why they hesitated was this—They were of opinion that the *status quo* in Turkey should be, if possible, maintained, and I understand from the right hon. Gentleman he is still of that opinion. [Mr. GLADSTONE: The territorial integrity.] You will find it difficult to maintain the territorial integrity of Turkey without acknowledging the principle of *status quo*. Let us see what the *status quo* in Turkey is. It is not an ancient order of society or political arrangement that has become obsolete. It has been tested in the severest manner and by the severest deeds only 20 years ago. It has been tested by a sanguinary war and by the Conferences of the great States; and the results of these material struggles and moral considerations had been expressed in solemn Treaties; and, therefore, the *status quo* is not a state or condition to be looked upon lightly or with disrespect; it is a *status quo* with which, in our opinion, it was not proper to interfere. If ever there was a case in which interference was to be deprecated it was, in our opinion, in the condition of Turkey, because it was quite obvious that, from the circumstances of the relations between Turkey and the other States of Europe, supported as they were by peculiar Treaties, the interference of other Powers would have been induced, and would have led to a perilous state of affairs. Therefore, to recognize and to wish to maintain the *status quo* of Turkey and to deprecate interference with its condition in order to allow Turkey and its subjects in the course of time to find that condition which suited both of them best, seemed to us the policy desirable. Therefore, we hesitated very much about joining the English Consul to the others in the delegation to the insurgents which failed. Then came the Andrassy Note. We hesitated about accepting that. We were influenced by the responsibility we should incur by departing from that concert of nations to which the right hon. Gentleman has just referred. Unquestionably, it is one of the great objects — and it ought to be one of the great objects—of this country to act in concert with its allies, and not to take a course which would isolate us unnecessarily when united action is more calculated to achieve success. But when we came to analyze the Andrassy Note we remembered there was very little in it which the Porte itself had not already undertaken, on the recommendation of the great Powers, to accomplish, so we felt that we could, under the circumstances, and for the sake of the united action and concert, take part in that Note. There were one or two matters which were new on which we reserved our opinion, but they were not of that importance which we might not fairly consider would be arranged satisfactorily; and, indeed, while we were considering what course should be taken with regard to allowing our Consul to join the other Powers in an urgent application to the insurgents, the Porte itself made an earnest appeal to us to allow our Consul to act as required, and so also to join in the Andrassy Note, and that settled the matter. The right hon. Gentleman, in his charge against the Government, blames us greatly for our conduct with respect to the Andrassy Note for allowing the initiative to pass into the hands of the other Powers; and yet I think he spoke early in the Session of the conduct of the Government in a very different tone. On the first night of the Session he said—"I am most grateful that Her Majesty's Government, instead of being actuated by that principle"—that is, that they had no right to expect anything from the Sultan —"I am most grateful to them for having given in their adhesion to the Austrian Note—[Mr. GLADSTONE: Hear, hear!]—and, for my part, I cordially express my acknowledgments to the Government." [Mr. GLADSTONE: Hear, hear!] How does the right hon. Gentleman reconcile those gracious expressions with the severe criticism with which he has just favoured me for giving in the adhesion of the Government to the Note? [Mr. GLADSTONE: No, no!] Then he blames us because we departed from the European concert. But he mistakes the nature of affairs. It is true that we on a subsequent occasion found ourselves in a state of isolation. England was in a state of isolation, and the five other Powers were not acting with us. But why was England in a state of isolation? She was isolated because she determined in favour of the principle of non-interference. But England is not in a state of isolation now, because the five Powers, after various attempts to produce effects in which they were not successful, have adopted the principle of non-interference—that is to say, that they have come over to us, and the six Powers are now acting in concert on the principle of non-interference. After the Andrassy Note there was an armistice; that was in March; and then, to the great surprise of those who were on the point of believing that the insurrection was terminated, the insurgents pressed new demands of an extraordinary kind. The Berlin Memorandum was proposed in May, and the right hon. Gentleman blames us for our course there, because we rejected the Berlin Memorandum on grounds on which the Turkish Government previously had given in their adhesion—as, for instance, the building of churches, the rebuilding of the houses that were destroyed, and the supporting of those who had quitted the Provinces and returned, and so on. It is very true that Her Majesty's Government did object to the Berlin Memorandum on many points not known to the House and to the country. It is very true that they objected to it on grounds which the Turkish Government had previously accepted. Why did we refuse to sanction the Berlin Memorandum? We did so because we knew that the Turkish Government and the Turkish nation could not fulfil the conditions which were laid down in the Berlin Memorandum, and because we knew that the Berlin Memorandum ended with an intimation that, if this effort failed, very different measures would be had recourse to. And, of course, the very failure by the Turks to fulfil the rash and reckless promises which, in their miserable state of despair, they were ready to make every day, would have been the foundation for that which we, who were advocating a policy of non-intervention, wished particularly to avoid. It was perfectly clear that as the Turks would necessarily fail to observe the conditions laid down, the Berlin Memorandum would have allowed active interference—an occupation, perhaps, and an occupation in a country like Turkey generally leads to war. Then the right hon. Gentleman says—"What has been the effect of our conduct in rejecting the Memorandum and in ordering Her Majesty's Fleet to Besika Bay?"—a subject on which I will in due time touch. The effect of our conduct, he says, is war with Servia. We drove Servia to war, he says, because she was in sheer despair at not getting redress for her grievances. But what had Turkey to do with the redress of the grievances of Servia? Servia was as independent a country, you might say, with regard to the Government of Turkey, as England herself. If Turkey had come forward and practically made all the changes which are included in all the Hatti-Sheriffs and Hatti-Humayouns in existence, it would not have affected Servia in the least. Nothing appears to me more unwarranted than to maintain that the policy of this country with regard to Turkey led to war with Servia. Servia could not be affected in any way. Servia required no redress. What Servia wanted was Provinces, a very different thing, and the Papers on the Table show that in the Spring she was preparing for war, on the supposition that she would commence it probably with the presence of some European Power. Well, then, the noble Lord the Member for Calne (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice), who appears to approve our having refused to sanction the Berlin Memorandum, asks us why, in refusing to give our adherence to that document, we did not think it our duty to propose an alternative. I differ from the noble Lord on that point. It was matter of opinion, and I think the Government would have made a mistake if, in rejecting the Berlin Memorandum, they had immediately offered a proposition of their own. One observation has been made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite with regard to the Andrassy Note of which I ought to take notice. It has been said that we should have required from the three Powers that we should be consulted. I think that is an objection very analogous and almost similar to the objection of the noble Lord in regard to the Berlin Memorandum. But I cannot say that I should ever deem it my duty—and I feel sure that none of my Colleagues would deem it to be their duty—to advise the Sovereign to offer her unsolicited presence and counsels to other Powers. If there are States which believe they can beneficially and usefully act together without our co-operation or without consulting us, I do not think it is either our duty or our policy to thrust ourselves upon them. And so with regard to the objection of the noble Lord respecting the Berlin Note, and his view that we ought to have made an alternative proposition. What chance would an alternative proposition from England have received from those three Powers? Those three Great Powers meet together to settle a difficult question. They give all their intelligence and their influence to the document which they produce. We reject it, and are to offer them a proposition of our own. What chance is there of its being accepted? I imagine myself that a worse chance could not exist. Their self-love, their just pride, their somewhat mortified feeling at the course which we had taken, all would have impelled them to reject our proposition. And my own opinion is that it is not a wise thing for a country, and a country like England, to make proposals which it has not the means of carrying into effect, and to sketch a policy, which is never difficult to do, but which a country like this ought certainly not to entertain unless it entertained it in a serious, practical, and determined manner. I might say also, when we are told that our conduct with regard to the Berlin Note produced the war with Servia, that the Berlin Note never was rejected by the Porte, and for this simple and very satisfactory reason, that it never was presented to the Porte. Therefore, the argument founded on the rejection of the Berlin Note being the occasion of the Servian War falls entirely to the ground. The fact is that the Berlin Memorandum was never presented to the Porte. It was no offensive act of the Porte of any kind that produced the war; it was an invasion on the part of Servia, who had not been interfered with; and, therefore, if the Note had been presented to the Porte and been rejected, even under those circumstances it could not for a moment be maintained that that was the cause, or one of the causes, of the war with Servia. The noble Lord the Member for Calne also made some remarks upon the difference between the policy of the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs and of myself. The noble Lord did not favour the House with any proofs, or even illustrations, of the somewhat interesting and unusual circumstance of persons in our respective positions, having the conduct of very responsible affairs, yet, at the same time, maintaining two different policies. It would have been, I think, only fair in making such statements if the noble Lord should have been furnished with some hint, if not evidence, however slight, that would have warranted him in making that statement. True it is that the noble Lord said a man would be considered a great fool who was not of that opinion.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, that the right hon. Gentleman had misunderstood his observation. He had said nothing of the kind.

Mr. DISRAELI: Well, I was not present when it was made, but it was one of those airy observations that are immediately reported to me. But then it seems that that is founded upon the way in which I treated the subject of the Fleet in Besika Bay, and the right hon. Gentleman has touched upon the same subject. Let me see if there was anything in what he said, and let us see what actually happened. No one with the Papers before him can deny that the statement of Lord Derby is accurate so far as it goes. There can be no doubt that the English Ambassador, alarmed at the state of affairs at Constantinople, joined with the Representatives of the different Powers there who agreed to take conjoint action, and determined that the best course that could be adopted was to send for their respective squadrons in the Mediterranean and have them brought into Turkish waters. Our Mediterranean Squadron at that moment was not very strong. Three of our ships arrived in Besika Bay and the squadrons of the other nations were soon established there also. The state of affairs at Constantinople at that moment was most critical. Even in that city, which has been the scene of some of the most violent occurrences in history, I do not know whether there was ever a period when there was greater danger, and when that danger was so indefinite, and caused such general alarm and terror. After the arrival of the ships in Besika Bay that condition of affairs grew worse from day to day—I must say, however, for our English Ambassador in Constantinople that he always took a more sanguine and courageous view of the state of affairs than his Colleagues did, and that he did not believe from his own observation that there was any fear of the religious feud between the Mussulmans and the Christians which was generally accepted as impending, and which so alarmed many; but he warned the Government that we must be prepared for startling events. There was, however, existing at the moment an anxiety, a dread, and a general apprehension, the nature of which was communicated by our Ambassador to the Government. This, then, was the state of things we had to consider. Whatever might have been the hopes of Sir Henry Elliot, the general opinion of people, and of people of great experience, seems to have been that some rising in the city of Constantinople against the Christian population was to be expected. What was going to happen? There were rumours afloat; no one knew exactly what they meant. Sometimes it was that there was to be an invasion of Constantinople at the instigation of the Sultan himself; sometimes, that there was to be a domestic revolution. We know very well that these waters had in time of public disturbance ever been the scene of sudden and startling events, and we felt that three ships in Besika Bay were under the circumstances but a very scanty protection, when, perhaps, you might have an insurrection stirred up in Salonica or on the coast of Syria, which was completely denuded of any protection whatever. We thought, therefore, that the time had arrived when we ought to take care that the Mediterranean Squadron should be somewhat more powerful than it was then. Let us look at what is the policy of England. The policy of England has ever been that the Mediterranean Sea should be considered as one of the great highways of our Indian Empire, and we have always held, and do hold it, that the waters of that sea and all the waters connected with it should be free and secure. When we are asked what is our policy, I say our policy is to secure those great results. Well, then, under these circumstances, we felt it our duty to increase the strength of the Mediterranean Squadron. We also felt that we should not be doing our duty to our country if we left events to happen and our interests to be protected only by two or three ships. It is quite true that it was originally at the invitation of the united Ambassadors and Ministers of the Great Powers that the Mediterranean Squadron and other squadrons repaired to these waters; but it is not true that we had not subsequently to consider our position; and it is also true that it was the unanimous conclusion of the Cabinet that it was our duty to see that the power of England should be more efficiently represented. It was no threat to any one. The Mediterranean Fleet is the symbol and the guarantee of our power. We could not and we never attempted to conceal that we had in that part of the world great interests which we must protect and never relinquish, and it was no threat to any particular Power that we said at such a moment that the Mediterranean Fleet, which is the guarantee and the symbol of our authority, should be there, that the world should know, whatever might happen, there should be no great change in the distribution of territories in that part of the world without the knowledge and consent of England. I do not call that a threat to any Power, and I cheerfully agree with the right hon. Gentleman who has just addressed us as to the conduct of those whom I will still, notwithstanding his criticism, call the Allies of our Sovereign throughout this matter. When I spoke the first night of the Session on the Address, and made some reference to the Andrassy Note, the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition intimated, though not in a very decided manner, a fear that perhaps Her Majesty's Government had interfered too much, and argued that some dangerous consequences might ensue. But I said then that I had the utmost confidence in the Great Powers—I was not ashamed to say that I believed in their entire sincerity, and I have not changed that opinion after six eventful months. I believe that the Governments of Russia and Austria have from the first—though they might, like ourselves, have made a mistake in their means—sincerely and unreservedly endeavoured to terminate these disturbances in Turkey. They felt that it was their interest to do so, and they have been most anxious to maintain the *status quo*. But, unfortunately, the world consists not merely of Emperors and Governments; it consists also of secret societies and revolutionary committees, and secret societies and revolutionary committees have been unceasingly at work in these affairs, and they do bring about in an Empire like Turkey most unexpected consequences, which may have a most injurious effect on British interests. When we are told that we sent our Fleet to the Dardanelles in order to maintain the Turkish Empire I deny it. It is not to maintain the Turkish Empire, and the Turkish Government were never deceived on that point. They were frequently informed from the first—as will be seen from the instructions to Sir Henry Elliot on the accession of the new Sultan—they were told they must reform their course and conduct; they must fulfil their engagements and obligations; and that our arrival in their waters was to maintain the interests of England and the British Empire, not to bolster up any Power that was falling into decrepitude from its own weakness. The Turkish Government is engaged at this moment in a civil war — it can hardly be considered more than that; but I cannot say that I have seen any cause at present why we should suddenly interfere. The right hon. Gentleman used the expression "prompt interference;" but, at the same time, he tells us he has nothing himself to propose. We are, according to his desire, to maintain the territorial integrity of Turkey; but, in my opinion, it would be in the long run a very unsatisfactory interference if you did not know when you interfered what you intended, what you wished to accomplish. Her Majesty's Government have shown no disposition to avoid the liabilities which are annexed to a great country like England, and which she must not shrink from. I am perfectly aware of our duties not merely arising from Treaties into which the country has entered, but the duties generally which we owe to civilization; you cannot, however, settle these things by making speeches at public meetings. That is not the way in which it is possible to encounter matters of such difficulty as are now agitating Europe. I cannot see, so far as I can review our conduct, that the Government have taken any course in these proceedings but such as the interests of this country required, and we have certainly not committed the country to any rash undertaking. We have said from the first that we were in favour of non-interference; we have said from the first that we should observe a strict neutrality if that strict neutrality were observed by others. There has been a difference of opinion between us and the other Powers; there has been some controversy; in what has it all ended? It has all ended by the other Powers adopting our policy. They have all, in a manner most unmistakeable, admitted that non-interference is the policy that ought to be pursued, and that neutrality is the process they ought to follow. When I am told by the right hon. Gentleman that we have lost our position in the European concert, I am bound to say that is not the opinion of Her Majesty's Government. I believe the other Powers are most ready and prepared to act with us. I have no doubt when the opportunity offers we shall find ourselves in that position which becomes the dignity of this country, and we shall have every opportunity which is desired to contribute to the general welfare of the world. The course which we have taken is the one which we believe we were called upon to pursue for the sake of our interests, and for the sake of our Empire; it was the course which, in the second place, we were called upon to pursue because we believed it was most conducive to the maintenance of peace; and thirdly, also, the one which we believed would lead to the progressive improvement of the population of the Turkish Empire. If there is to be nothing but confusion, if we are to have nothing but struggles and war, if secret societies and revolutionary committees are to ride rampant over those fair Provinces, I shall cordially deplore such a result as much as Gentlemen who attack me very often for my want of sympathy with the sufferers by imaginary atrocities. I must say I have greater confidence than some have in the sense and prudence of Governments. I cannot believe that the scenes which have taken place during the last six months in these Turkish Provinces can be maintained, and when the occasion arrives we shall be ready to take our responsible part in what I hope may be the pacification of these countries, their advancement in civilization, and their general improvement. But I agree with the right hon. Gentleman who has just addressed us, our task is not an easy one. Hitherto we have experienced the generous confidence of Parliament, and I hope I may say, notwithstanding the criticism of the right hon. Gentleman, after the six months which have now passed, Parliament having had ample opportunity of examining and criticising our conduct, the general opinion of Parliament, and, I believe, the general opinion of the country, is that we have not been remiss in our duty. I know the difficulties which now await us. I know that for some time to come we cannot rely upon that which has been our main reliance—the sustaining power of Parliament—under many difficulties of late. But if we feel that we have the confidence of our countrymen, great as may be the difficulties we may have to encounter—vast as may be the responsibility of public men under such circumstances—we shall not shrink from doing our duty. And I trust that in fulfilling it we shall not disappoint the expectations of the country.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I regret that the exigencies of the Government and the manner in which they have thought fit to conduct the Business of this House have rendered it necessary to discuss this question in so brief and unsatisfactory a manner. When the Government thought that seven or eight days were not wasted upon the discussion of a clause in an Education Bill—a clause, moreover, not introduced by themselves—it was somewhat extraordinary that we should be told at an early period of this evening that according to the Government distribution of our time it was impossible we should be allowed more than one evening this week for the discussion of affairs which have occupied the attention of the whole country since the meeting of Parliament. It is not long since Lord Derby, speaking to a deputation, informed them, and through them the country, that it was of the greatest importance to the Ministers, who were, he said, the servants of the country, that they should receive instructions from their employers, and that one of the greatest difficulties of a Government was that they were unable to know what were the intentions of their employers until it was too late. I do not know whether Lord Derby did not rather underrate the responsibility under which the Government acts. I should have thought it might sometimes have been the duty of the servants of the Queen to conduct the foreign policy of the country in a manner not altogether accordant to the instructions of those whom Lord Derby called their employers. But, at the same time, there can be no doubt that it is of vast importance to the Government to feel that the policy they pursue is supported by the general feeling, and sense, and intelligence of the country. And certainly there never was a more difficult, embarrassing, or perplexing question placed before the country for its consideration; and one of the best and chief modes by which the Government can form and test opinion on the events that are passing and the policy they ought to pursue would undoubtedly be by discussion in Parliament. I think we must all feel that we are at a great difficulty in discussing this question by reason of the paucity of the information in our possession. What we know respecting these distant countries and these different nationalities is so imperfect that it is impossible not to feel that we have not before us all the materials we could desire for the complete consideration of this question, and therefore a full discussion by Parliament was the more necessary. According to the Notice Paper no fewer than four propositions were to have been placed before the House for its consideration, yet but only three of the hon. Members who have given Notice of Resolutions on the subject have barely had time to express their views. I therefore think it will not be denied that sufficient time has not been afforded for the discussion of those propositions, and, indeed, I am, to some extent, consoled for the shortness of the debate by the thought that the lateness of the hour relieves me from the responsibility of stating, at any great length, my own views upon the subject before the House. If I were to attempt in a few words to state the impression formed on my own mind by a perusal of the Papers, I should say that the views taken by Her Majesty's Government were in the main just, and that the objects which the Government endeavoured to accomplish were in the main such as the country would be disposed to approve. At the same time, I should also be obliged to say that the measures which the Government adopted with a view of attaining those objects are open to grave and serious question. The right hon. Gentleman has not committed himself or his Government to a policy founded upon a belief in the indefinite duration of the state of things now existing in the Turkish Empire. On the contrary, he has stated his opinion on that point in terms which appear to have been completely satisfactory to no less a personage than Prince Gortchakoff. On the other hand, the Government appear to see in the fact that an insurrection has broken out in some of the Turkish Provinces—stimulated, no doubt, to a great extent by influences from without—no cause for the immediate disruption of the Turkish Empire. They joined the three Powers in calling upon Turkey to institute certain reforms, but they declined to call upon her to carry out reforms which appeared to be impossible of acceptance. They have remonstrated against the neglect shown by a neighbouring Government in allowing the insurrection to be stimulated from without, and have expressed their opinion, although, possibly, not in terms which many of us would consider adequate, as to the means taken by the Turkish Government to repress the rebellion. When we look at the views held by the Government they appear at the first sight to be such as will meet the general approval of the country. At the same time, I cannot help thinking that there has been a certain want of firmness, clearness, and decision in the tone and language of the despatches. It is true that my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich expressed our approval of the course taken by Her Majesty's Government in adopting the Andrassy Note, but we withheld our approval of the action of the Government until we had full knowledge of all the circumstances. It is to be regretted that at an early stage of the proceedings Her Majesty's Government did not protest against the new policy that was being inaugurated by the three Great Northern Powers adopting the Note in consultation, and then sending it for approval or rejection to the other Powers which had had no share in the previous consultation. When, however, the Government had made up their minds to adopt the Note, I think there was a great absence of firmness and decision in the manner in which the Note was pressed upon the consideration of the Turkish Government. The tone of the despatch in which the Note was recommended to the Porte by Her Majesty's advisers was rather an apology to the Porte for pressing the proposals contained in the Note upon its consideration than a vigorous representation that the proposals contained in the Note were the only ones which would enable the Turkish Government to retain the confidence and support of the European Powers. But when they were told that Her Majesty's Government would rather abstain from pressing certain reforms, it was not at all surprising that, in view of a line of conduct such as that, the Porte should treat the Note very much as a matter of course, instead of paying any particular amount of attention to it. On the other hand, I fail to see that Her Majesty's Government have remonstrated with the firmness and vigour which might have been expected with those Powers, who have allowed breaches of their neutrality to be caused by the assistance given to the insurgents by their subjects. I cannot conceive any action more unjust to the Turkish Government, and more calculated to prevent a pacific solution of these difficulties than the breach of neutrality which thus appears to have occurred. At the moment when reforms were pressed upon Turkey by the Great Powers of Europe, many of their subjects appear to have been engaged in encouraging the insurrection. How was it possible that the Turkish Government, which was trying to suppress the insurrection, should be able at the same time to introduce reforms? There seems to have been a great want of energy in the representations made by the Government in this respect. Further, I cannot help thinking that, though the Government had from time to time made representations on this subject, their effect would have been much strengthened if, instead of discouraging discussion in this House, it had been allowed to discuss the matter earlier, so that it might have been made known to Europe by the representations of Her Majesty's Government that some of the so-called neutral Powers were themselves violating the obligations of neutrality. It would have been much to the advantage of our Allies, the Turks, that that fact should thus have been made known to the whole of Europe, because they would have known in an authoritative manner that the war was encouraged by other Powers. I now come to to the Berlin Memorandum. It appears to be generally acknowledged that the Government had no alternative than to agree unconditionally to that Memorandum. But it does not seem necessary that, in rejecting it, Her Majesty's Government should have supplied the Turkish Government with reasons for rejecting every one of the propositions contained in the Memorandum. Instead of discussing these propositions in an argumentative spirit, it would surely have been better to rest their rejection upon the simple circumstance, which really made acceptance impossible — namely, that the Memorandum had been agreed upon altogether without consultation with England and the other Powers, and that it contained certain propositions the acceptance of which, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, was incompatible with the dignity and self-respect of the Porte. The right hon. Gentleman says that no evil consequences followed the unconditional rejection of this Memorandum by Her Majesty's Government. "It is true," says the right hon. Gentleman, "that at the moment of rejection we stood in a position of isolation; but since that time the European Governments have come round to our opinion, and we now stand in concert with them in defence of the principle of non-interference." But I think it is scarcely possible to doubt that the unconditional rejection of this Memorandum was the immediate cause of the outbreak of war between Turkey and Servia and Montenegro. The right hon. Gentleman says that the Servians were not affected by the Memorandum. But he has himself acknowledged that there was great sympathy with the insurgents in Servia; and when it appeared that, through the action of Her Majesty's Government, the further proposals of the European Powers were not even to be presented to the Porte, it was not unnatural that this sympathy in Servia should become uncontrollable, and that the Servian Government should find it impossible any longer to restrain its subjects from war. It is quite evident from a perusal of the Papers that the Servians were prepared for war long prior to the rejection of the Memorandum, and were only restrained by the action of the other Powers; and it is also clear that the rejection of the Memorandum by the British Government was the signal for a relaxation of the pressure up to that time exercised by the Russian Government, and that after that rejection the pressure on Servia was relaxed, and Servia was allowed, if not encouraged, to declare war. I cannot, I must add, help thinking that there has been a miserable want of energy and vigour in the remonstrances —the frequent remonstrances, I admit— which have been made by the Government as to the excesses and cruelties which have from time to time been committed by the Turks on the insurgents. I admit that remonstrances have been made, but have they, I would ask, been made with all the force and energy possible? Lectures have, indeed, been read to the Turkish Government, but have they been told that their last chance of retaining the sympathy of any portion of the people of this country—even of those who have hitherto been their warmest friends—was in danger of being forfeited by such conduct as that which had been attributed to them? Were they informed that the excuses which were from time to time put forward for that conduct, to the effect that those excesses had been provoked by similar excesses on the part of the insurgents, and that they had not been committed by the Regular troops of the Porte, but by auxiliaries, were in reality no excuses at all for such proceedings? Were they told, as they should have been, with the necessary firmness, that no Government purporting to be a civilized European Government had any right to shelter itself behind its own weakness? What, he should like to know, would have been said if a few years ago, when we had to deal with the Fenian insurrection, we, instead of employing Regular troops or an organized police, had invoked the assistance of the Orangemen of the North of Ireland, and if the religious bitterness which then existed in that country had led to excesses of one kind or another? Would Europe have considered it a sufficient excuse for those excesses that we had not at the moment a sufficient force of Regular troops or of police to grapple with the insurrection? I maintain that a Government that is not able to deal with an insurrection by means of Regular troops, or by a force of police organized under its own command, and which has to put forward such excuses in extenuation of its excesses, is not fit to occupy a position as one of the Powers of civilized Europe. I will refer for a moment to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman on the despatch of our Fleet to Besika Bay. If there has been one circumstance which more than another had given satisfaction to the country during these prolonged negotiations, and which had mitigated the anxiety felt throughout the country, it has been that whatever may have occurred in other parts of Europe and in other Cabinets, the policy pursued by this Government and this Cabinet was open and straightforward. That impression should not be weakened. I cannot help thinking, however, that there are discrepancies, differences, and divergences between the public utterances of the right hon. Gentleman and the noble Lord the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that are not calculated to strengthen the impression of the perfect openness and straightforwardness of the policy of the Government of this country. The right hon. Gentleman, in speaking of the speech of Lord Derby to the deputation the other day, used an expression which I cannot help thinking was somewhat unfortunate. The right hon. Gentleman said that that statement was true "as far as it went." I have taken an opportunity of looking at the statement of the noble Lord, and I cannot see on the face of it that there is any reservation whatever. Indeed, I think the noble Lord himself could not say that it was not intended to be a full explanation of the policy of the Government, as far as that matter was concerned. Yet the right hon. Gentleman comes down this evening and says that the noble Lord's statement was correct, but only as far as it went. The right hon. Gentleman has told now that the prime object in sending the Fleet to Besika Bay was that mentioned by Lord Derby—the protection of the Christians in Constantinople and other parts of Turkey in the great excitement that prevailed at that time, but that there were political reasons besides—that the Mediterranean was one of our highways to India, and for commerce, and that we had a sort of supremacy to maintain in that sea. Well, we are a great Mediterranean Power, and if there were political purposes to serve in sending the Fleet to Besika Bay I should not quarrel with the right hon. Gentleman. But it is most unfortunate that if the Government had other objects in view the noble Lord when he addressed the deputation did not state fully the views of the Government on that point. We know there was no intention to deceive the House of Commons or the public; but it is necessary in this matter that we should consider not only ourselves, but others who are not our own countrymen. What will be the natural effect of such a divergence in declarations made on the part of the Government? When the Prime Minister gives one account of the despatch of the Fleet and the Foreign Secretary another, may it not very naturally be concluded that the real explanation of the matter is different from that given by either Minister? We have testimony that the despatch of the Fleet was supposed at Constantinople and other places to be a demonstration in favour of Turkey, and it was so supposed throughout Europe. ["No, no!"] It was interpreted to be an intimation on the part of Her Majesty's Government that come what might Turkey had the English Fleet and the English Government behind her; and I cannot help thinking that a plain, straightforward declaration at the earliest moment by the Government of their real intentions in despatching the Fleet would have done more to dissipate any false ideas entertained on the subject than the two versions of the affair which have been made public. As to the Motion and the Amendments which have been placed on the Paper, it appears to me that the House will not attain any very useful object by coming to any decision upon either of them. If it were the intention of the Government to intervene, or if it were the desire of the House that the Government should intervene in the quarrel which is now in progress, it might be useful that we should express our opinion as to the particular remedy which the circumstances of Turkey at present require. But as the Government have no intention of interfering in the war, or in the suppression of the rebellion, and as this House, I am sure, has no wish that it should so interfere, I cannot see what advantage can be gained at this moment by such an expression of opinion as to the particular remedy by which the evils under which Turkey is suffering should be met. The time may come when the Government in concert with other Powers may usefully interpose with its advice, and, no doubt, if the House should then be sitting, it might be an interesting question whether the proposal of the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce), or that of the hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. Forsyth), or that of the noble Lord the Member for Calne (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice), would be the one most applicable to the case. I am glad that at this moment all Party element has been removed from these Resolutions by the alteration made in the terms of that of the noble Lord the Member for Calne. From what I have said it will be clearly seen that I have no desire to place upon record any condemnation of the conduct of the Government. I think that in the main the policy which they have adopted is right, although I may have had objections to the means they have adopted to carry out that policy and to enforce their views. I agree with my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich that nothing could have been more difficult than the circumstances in which Her Majesty's Government were placed. On the other hand, I cannot say that it would be satisfactory to me at this moment to be called upon to express my satisfaction with the whole of the policy or with the reasons for the policy of the Government. I cannot help thinking that when we separate—as I hope we shall in a few weeks—the Government will not find their position in regard to this question very satisfactory. They have obtained nothing but promises from the Turkish Government, things which they have had over and over again, but they have obtained no security that these promises will be fulfilled. On the other hand, while Her Majesty's Government profess and, no doubt, feel great sympathy for the Turkish Government in the difficulties which surround it, while they have been nominally acting in concert with other Powers, they have been unable to prevent the action of certain portions of the subjects of such Powers, or even avert the outbreak of a war between the Porte and one of its tributaries. At this moment, after all the diplomatic assistance which the Government have been able to give Turkey, that country is fighting to maintain the integrity of its dominions and to resist an invasion the success of which would be the utter destruction of the Turkish Empire. An attempt has been made to show that the Berlin Memorandum was not accepted by our Government, because it would not secure the objects which Her Majesty's Government have in view. If that were so, it would in a sense be a triumph for our diplomacy. But if that triumph was to be obtained only by the success of our own policy, then I am unable to see that any triumph has been obtained, and I think the hon. Member for Portsmouth has been well advised by omitting from the terms of his Resolution those words which might provoke discussion. I am sorry to have detained the House so long.

Mr. DISRAELI explained that he did not wish to interrupt the noble Lord in his speech, but he had not quoted his noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs exactly. What Lord Derby said was this—

> "With regard to the bringing up of the British Fleet, there, again, you will have in Parliament more full and more complete explanations than any I can give here."

The Marquess of HARTINGTON also explained. It was the following passage to that referred to by the right hon. Gentleman that he had quoted.

Mr. BRUCE wished to avoid giving the House any trouble in the matter. If his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Marylebone (Mr. Forsyth) would withdraw his Amendment he would withdraw his Motion.

Mr. FORSYTH said, he willingly concurred in the suggestion.

Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 1*st August,* 1876.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Bishopric of Truro * (201).
Second Reading—Winter Assizes (200).
Committee—Report—Parochial Records * (194).
Third Reading—Notices to Quit (Ireland) * (188), and *passed.*

SAT FIRST IN PARLIAMENT.

William Richard Lord Harlech—Was introduced by virtue of a special limitation in the patent dated 14th January 1876, and sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother John Ralph Lord Harlech, and took the Oath.

WINTER ASSIZES BILL.

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

(No. 200.) second reading.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, it had been passed in the other House for the purpose of meeting an evil which had been seriously felt in one or two recent cases where a prisoner had been committed for trial immediately after the Summer Assizes, and in consequence of no Winter Assizes being held in the county his trial had not come on till the following March. In one case, which attracted public attention very recently, a prisoner was acquitted after having been in gaol for six or seven months. The rule was that a Winter Assize should not be held for a county unless a certain number of prisoners — six, he believed — were awaiting trial. The object of the present Bill was simply to enable an Order in Council to be made, which for the purpose of Winter Assizes would unite certain adjacent counties. In conclusion, he moved the second reading of the Bill.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

ARMY—MOBILIZATION.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Lord WAVENEY: My Lords, in rising to call the attention of your Lordships to the system of mobilization recently introduced into this country, and to ask the noble Earl the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether it is proposed to mobilize any additional corps during the present drill season, I will begin by assuring Her Majesty's Government that, although I shall be obliged in the course of my observations to notice what I consider to be some deficiencies in our system and endeavour to suggest other means for carrying out the great object in view, I have no desire to cast any reflections upon them. With regard to this moblization principle so general on the Continent, it has there a double meaning. It was originally intended for the purpose of organizing expeditionary forces, but subsequently it has been used there, and especially as I apprehend it is used in the German Empire, for the purpose of distribution of troops. In our own country, according to the arrangement in *The Army List*, it is intended for the purposes of defence; but by that arrangement there is only one purely military corps as exemplified in Her Majesty's regular forces, and that is the first army corps, or the Army Corps of Colchester, which is composed exclusively of battalions of the Line, Artillery of the Regular service, and, with the exception of two Corps of Yeomanry, of Regular Cavalry. In the other army corps there is a much larger infusion of the Militia service. The first division is almost entirely composed, as regards the Infantry, of Regiments of the Line; but the other division is supplemented from the Militia of England, of Ireland, and of Scotland. There are six army corps provided for the defence of this country, one for Ireland, and one for Scotland. I am not disposed, by any means, to find fault with a system that brings the local soldier from one part of the Kingdom to another, because it gives him the opportunity of studying the customs and habits of his fellow-subjects, and of obtaining information which he would not otherwise have an opportunity of doing. And I may remark, in passing, that in the new Kingdom of Italy, where affairs are administered with a sagacity that gives an example to the older Monarchies of Europe, that the movement of troops from one point of the Italian peninsula to another is mainly relied upon for the purpose of welding the men from the different provinces into one harmonious and congruous force. With regard to the operations of the army corps this year, I have no fault to find. I remember that last year when I brought the subject generally before your Lordships I rather regretted that a larger system of manœuvring had not been adopted than that attained, and I was told that the system had only been in existence for three years, and that the time for extended operations had not returned: still, I do not find fault with the experiment that has been made this year, and that the movement of the troops on a large scale has been postponed, because, under all circumstances, a great gain has been achieved in the military system of this country, and we have learnt much that we should not have known unless this plan of mobilization had been put in force and carried out. I do not complain of the change of system; but it seems to me that the mobilization, so far as it has gone, has not been altogether so complete as it might have been; and I would suggest that a remedy should be found for our shortcomings in the mobilization of our troops, so as to be able to assemble the largest possible number of men and *matériel* in the shortest time at some given point, from which the expeditionary forces might prepare for ulterior movements. To such an extent is this carried on on the Continent, that I have seen a table in which the time is calculated with sufficient accuracy for the information of a Government in which it is possible to assemble a corps from all the points of a district, and the time that would elapse for their further movement in any given direction to the frontier. This principle has been, to a certain extent, overlooked at Aldershot; but at Salisbury a happy accident has given the Commander of the district a practical opportunity of seeing how soon an army corps can be concentrated on a given point. There is no official Report of the circumstance; but we may trust implicitly in the statements of the military correspondents of the Press as to what occurred. Some outlying regiments beyond Salisbury were assembled simply for the purpose, as they believed, of returning home. They were called upon late in the evening to prepare to march to the railway from their camping ground on one side of Salisbury. I know the ground well, and the difficulties of moving troops over it. The movement was rapidly executed, and subsequently received the approval of the General commanding. That is one point to be gained in mobilization. There is another point about which a great deal has been said—and I think rather unnecessarily—in disparagement in the training and teaching afforded to the army corps. It has been said that the troops were inconvenienced from the want of food, and in this country I am afraid it must occasionally be the case, because we have to depend upon contractors to furnish the troops with food. In Prussia it is done by requisition. That, however, is not our position, and we are obliged to depend upon contractors to a very great extent. But with regard to transport, it would seem that a very considerable improvement can be effected. I believe that for the transport both of men and heavy *matériel* some very different system from that now in use is required. For instance, it is matter of notoriety to all concerned in the movement of heavy stores that a large cart with two wheels is far superior to a large waggon with four wheels. There is another point which is of some importance. I am now going to speak of the force as assembled at particular points. I took occasion last year to request a Return of the troops under arms on a particular day in July, in order that I might compare them with the establishment of the regiments from which they were drawn. The result is somewhat remarkable. It should be an object in our Service to bring the force upon paper, as near as possible, in accord with the force in array; but I find, from the Return, that there is a considerable discrepancy between the strength and the establishment. I find, for instance, that the strength of troops of all arms at Aldershot on the 12th of July last year was 21,762, and that there was absent from the colours on the establishment at Aldershot 5,683. Your Lordships will observe that this is one-fifth, or nearly so, of the strength of the establishment. If we were to permit this to escape our notice, and to overlook the consequences which it might have on our defensive strength, I need scarcely tell your Lordships that calamitous results might arise. Some of these reductions from the strength are, however, inevitable. I find from another Return, which was moved for in the other House of Parliament, as regards the strength of the Infantry regiments at head-quarters, that there were present 12,447, and that there were absent 814 sick, or convalescent, 552 engaged on recruiting service, and 464 the cause of whose absence was not clearly defined, and others were detached on special duty. That shows an aggravation of the discrepancy of which I have spoken. Now, as regards the results of these manœuvres, we were anxious to see how the troops mobilized could perform their duties. There can be no doubt that the training drill and appointments of all branches of the Regular Service were very complete. I do not know whether any of your Lordships were present at the march past at Aldershot on the 22nd of July; but the guns, Cavalry, and Infantry of the Line were what we have ever seen them, and I hope always will continue to see them. The Militia attracted the observation and praise, as I believe, of all who were competent to pronounce an opinion. Those who saw what were the nature of the movements, and saw how they were performed, will admit that the Militia were not unworthy comrades of the Line. After the first march past, the column, headed by three battalions of regular Infantry, was massed on a hill, which may be familiar to some of your Lordships. The Scotch and Irish regiments belonged to General M'Murdo's brigade; but so limited was the ground on which they had to move, that being desirous of communicating with General M'Murdo, I had great difficulty in passing my horse between the columns of soldiers. I remained to see the reverse march; and I can assure your Lordships—and I am certain that if the illustrious Duke who was present on that occasion were here to-day he would confirm what I say—that the Militia disentangled themselves from that dense, but not confused, mass with the steadiness of old soldiers. There was this also to remark—that the Infantry of the Line showed that though young soldiers, not in their discipline but in their youthful form, they gave promise of what they would come to. The Militia regiments were remarked as being stout and active. But there was one element of power which was absent on that day. By some arrangement, which I will not question, the soldiers of the Reserve which had been attached to the division had been dismissed; but from other persons I heard only one opinion of these men—first, of their personal and physical qualities; second, of their readiness to be attached to any regiment where their services were required; thirdly, of the facility with which they resumed their old habits; and fourthly, as I have learned from the Returns, that of those who were summoned the number which accepted the summons was almost complete. In the preceding year the men belonging to the first class Army Reserve were invited to attend the manœuvres. From 15 of the military districts there was no result; and from the remaining districts there were only 84 volunteers, of which 62 were present. I think that the time has now come when the country may be congratulated on the possession of a Reserve force. I myself looked with considerable apprehension on the substitution of the short-service for the long-service system. In many quarters the change was viewed with disfavour, and, to a considerable extent, with apprehension; but the risk was encountered, and the country may be congratulated on the result. Year after year probably this Force will increase, and eventually give us such a force as on an emergency will be sufficient to bring up the peace establishments of our Cavalry and Infantry to the war complement. There are some points on which it seems to me improvement may be effected. In the Yeomanry, for example, I think that some alterations may well be made. Where large and powerful regiments are formed it may be easy to maintain the organization of the Cavalry of the Line; but I cannot help thinking that an organization somewhat similar to that of the irregular forces in India would be better suited to the smaller regiments of Yeomanry. In many counties, owing to the alterations in the system of agriculture, it is not so easy now as it was years ago to find the description of trooper which is especially required. The men whom it would be desirable to bring into the Yeomanry service are the sons and relatives of the Yeomanry class of farmers; and therefore I take leave to suggest, whether it would not be wise to form provisional regiments of Yeomanry in the same way as provisional battalions of Volunteers are formed, of different strength, according to circumstances. I now come to what I may call the second phase of the question—the army corps system. I would consider it not inadvisable to establish one army corps as an absolute body complete in all its strength. If it be desirable to establish such a body, it should be in a central position, and that central position has already been indicated by the establishment at Aldershot. The principle of which I am speaking has, to a certain extent, been justified by the way in which the troops have been connected during this last mobilization at Aldershot. One army corps was completely made up of troops of the Line, Cavalry, and Artillery; and if an expeditionary force were to be sent abroad, it would be at once available for this purpose. I am afraid that I have trespassed too long on your Lordships in calling attention to the mobilization of these two corps, and I now proceed to the Question of which I have given Notice. The Question is, Whether it is proposed to mobilize any additional corps during the present drill season? I am not aware whether there be any Militia regiments still to be called out for training; and if there be no regiments, there is the marching-out season for the Line Regiments, which may be always well employed. It might, therefore, be possible for generals commanding in one district to place themselves in communication with troops occupying the next district. There would be no great difficulty in one corps placing itself in military relations with a neighbouring corps. The Chester army corps, for instance, might find itself in military relations with the North of England army corps. In such cases the marchings would not be of a very severe nature. The troops might be expected to cover, without difficulty, some 25 miles of ground, and 25 miles of ground on the one side would bring them into tactical communication with corps that had marched the same distance from another quarter. I have only now to express a hope that the remarks which I have made will induce the Government to give us their views—especially on the question of the mobilization of additional army corps.

EARL CADOGAN said, he had heard with satisfaction the favourable opinion which the noble Lord had expressed of the scheme for the mobilization of the Army, for he was aware that not only was the noble Lord eminently qualified to give an opinion on the subject, but that he had satisfied himself by personal inspection of the various matters to which he had referred. The scheme for the defence of the country to which the name of mobilization had been given, had, perhaps, from its novelty, given rise to considerable misunderstanding, and he might be allowed to offer a few remarks in the hope that he might be able to clear up some misapprehensions existing on the subject. In the first place, the scheme of mobilization was entirely one for the defence of the country. The noble Lord had said that there were two phases of the question—one was for the defence of the country, and the other was an organization of a force for expeditionary purposes. As the scheme for the defence of the country was the only one recognized by the military authorities, he must be excused if he did not follow the noble Lord into the second phase. The object of the mobilization scheme was not to re-construct, or, directly speaking, to increase our Army—its object was to organize that which they had, and to make arrangements to use to the best of their power their military strength in case of immediate necessity. With that object it was divided into army corps, divisions, and brigades; various points in the country were chosen to which the various army corps would be sent, and at which head-quarters and divisional quarters were to be situated; and routes were issued which would enable commanding officers to reach with facility the destinations to which they were sent. It was only the first part of the scheme which had been tested this year. No doubt in time of war their work would not end there. It would not be sufficient to bring the army corps to the various posts assigned to them—it would be necessary that they should be moved forward according to the exigency of the moment or of the movements of the enemy they had to meet. That did not occur this year. Having brought the men forward and placed them in standing camps, advantage was taken of the situation to drill the Militia during the period of their annual training; and that done, the troops returned to the quarters from whence they came. The fact that it was only the first part of the scheme which had been carried out might account for the various objections which had been made by the noble Lord and by others as to what had been done. The noble Lord alluded, as he understood, to the drills, and said they were not sufficient; he also objected to the transport. The authorities might be excused if they did not go into extravagance in that direction. Their Lordships no doubt knew that in the case of transport waggons they might be divided into two classes —"technical" waggons and ordinary waggons. He did not attempt to conceal any deficiencies, and he admitted they were not adequately provided with technical waggons. It was stated that the mobilization was not practical. In making this experiment of mobilization it was necessary to select a convenient time and place, and thus various difficulties had been encountered, which in the case of a sudden emergency would not exist. He was authorized to state, and he did so with confidence, that should war or invasion threaten this country the mobilization of the troops could be effected much more expeditiously than in the present instance. As to the number of Reserves which attended the manœuvres, the Returns now being prepared would be found highly satisfactory. He believed he might state that of those summoned to attend the manœuvres, the absentees did not amount to more than 2 per cent; and in connection with this fact it was gratifying to observe that the men had been universally praised for their good conduct and soldierly bearing, and for their general excellence in the discharge of their duties. With regard to the disposition of the troops under the mobilization scheme—something had been said as to bringing Scotch and Irish Militia regiments such a distance to join in the exercises: but he was sure their Lordships would see on reflection that it was advisable to give Scotland and Ireland a share in the defence of the country at those strategic points which were deemed by qualified judges to be the most liable to attack. Having now touched on the principal objections urged against the mobilization scheme, it only remained for him to state, in answer to the noble Lord's inquiry, that it was not intended to mobilize any additional corps during the present drill season. The noble Lord would recollect that an Act of Parliament would be required for such a step to be taken. Besides, the necessary funds had not been voted. The extent to which such operations might be carried in future necessarily depended on the will of Parliament. With regard to the time at which these manœuvres were to be held, he believed he was right in saying that last year he did not give any distinct pledge, but merely stated in a general way the intentions of the Government.

Viscount CARDWELL congratulated the noble Earl (Earl Cadogan) not only on the satisfactory statement which he had had to make, but also on the lucid and interesting manner in which he had made it. He regarded these experiments in the mobilization of the Army as of great importance, because they were the natural outcome of the Intelligence Department which had been recently established, and which had been found to be one of the greatest wants of our Army administration. The noble Earl had rightly said that if we had to organize an expedition to a foreign country it could not be carried out by means of a system of local mobilization. Of course the system of local mobilization was purely defensive. A continental Power might make it the means of invading a neighbouring country; but with this country the circumstances were entirely different. In our insular position the first thing to be done in organizing an expedition to foreign parts was to provide means of transporting the troops, and the next to find a base of operations in the country where they landed—matters with which local mobilization had nothing whatever to do. Another thing to be noticed was that in case of war it would not be in small local bodies that the Army and Auxiliary Forces would be employed. It might be very proper to assemble them in that way in the first instance, but the chief step would be to aggregate them into a manœuvring Army. And here, again, the present experiment would have no bearing. Local mobilization, in fact, was only a part of our system of defence; for on emergency it would be necessary to employ the railway system of the country for the transport of troops to the point of danger. With regard to the present experiment, he could not refrain from expressing his great satisfaction at the General Order recently issued by His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief in reference to the recent manœuvres. His Royal Highness expressed his entire satisfaction with his inspection of the several regiments both of the Regulars and of the Reserves. One remarkable feature of the experiment was the large turn-out of the Reserves, inasmuch as it demonstrated the falsity of the prediction that that branch of our Forces would be found unsatisfactory. The absence of pensions, it was thought, would deter men from joining the Army; but he found that up to the year 1875 no fewer than 57,700 men had enlisted for short service. These Returns showed that when the choice was given men preferred short service and the Reserve to long service and a pension. If anybody had told him four years ago that the deficiency of those summoned in time of peace would not exceed 2 per cent he should have thought him a sanguine prophet. And what had been their character? His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief expressed his gratification at the satisfactory condition and the exemplary conduct while under training of such portions of the first class Army Reserve as had been called out; adding that their efficiency was such that unless special circumstances should arise they would not have to be called out again. It was right to put them to a severe test, and to ascertain whether they were paper men only or men who could be relied upon; but it was not desirable to call them out unnecessarily to the disturbance of their civil employment, and any apprehension had been dispelled by the course pursued:—it had been thought proper to call away only a proportion of the men from their civil employments, and the results had been eminently satisfactory. That being the state of the case, he rejoiced that he was able to congratulate his noble Friend opposite on the statement he had made, and he could only hope that all the experiments of his Department would be attended with equal success.

BARBADOES.—OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON, in calling attention to the Parliamentary Papers relating to the recent disturbances in Barbadoes, said: I regret very much that my noble Friend (the Earl of Kimberley), on whose account the statement which I am about to make was postponed the other night, is still so far from well as to be unable to be in his place this evening. Since then an hon. Friend of mine in "another place" (Mr. J. Lowther) has made a statement on the subject of which I have given Notice, which in many respects has traversed the ground that I had intended to take, and that relieves me from the necessity of entering at any length upon it. I shall therefore confine myself to adding one or two points that seem to me of importance, and to reminding your Lordships of the general bearings of the case. I refrain from reciting the history of these transactions in Barbadoes—they are still sufficiently fresh in your Lordships' minds to dispense me from that task. The Blue Book on this subject may be roughly said to contain, first, the statement of the facts; secondly, the complaints which various parties in Barbadoes have made either directly or indirectly as regards the action of Her Majesty's Government; and thirdly, and most important of all, the charges that have been brought against Governor Hennessy. With respect to the statement of the facts, those facts are so well known that I need not trouble you with them. As to the complaints, they substantially divide themselves into two heads—there is more or less complaint with reference to the subject of Confederation; there are also complaints with regard to certain changes which have been made in the Executive Council, and which the Assembly of Barbadoes seem to resent as a great innovation on the Constitution. With respect to the third, I shall have more to say before I sit down. As regards Confederation, I need not go into the whole of its history. Successive Secretaries of State have endorsed it, and it may, therefore, be fairly assumed that their opinion is in favour of such a measure. But I would point out what Confederation really means. Confederation in Canada means one thing; it might mean at the Cape of Good Hope another; it certainly means a very different thing in the West India Islands, where the scale and measure of things are smaller than in either of the other colonies I have named. What did Confederation in the West India Islands mean? What did it mean specially in Barbadoes? I might take the six points, as they are called, of Governor Hennessy. They comprise the appointment of an Auditor General, the transport of prisoners from one island to another, one common lazaretto, the re-modelling of the judicial system, and one police force common to the whole of the Islands. There is nothing very grand or very formidable in these proposals. It is, perhaps, in some respects a misnomer to speak of them as Confederation—it is rather an amalgamation of some municipal arrangements. At the same time I do not underrate the importance of such a change. It has been admitted, as I have said, by successive Secretaries of State to be important and desirable. At present there is a multiplication of offices in these Islands — a separate Judicial Staff for each, a Chief Justice, an Attorney General, and so forth. There is also, by consequence, a great waste of public money and very frequent inefficiency; and with a multiplication of offices, a waste of public money, and inefficiency, there follow a whole train of evils which I need not specify, because they will easily suggest themselves to your Lordships, but evils demoralizing to the public life of these communities, and such as it is the duty of the Government, if possible, to check. When I wrote my despatch on this so-called Confederation, I was well aware that an unfriendly feeling might be entertained in Barbadoes on the subject. There had, no doubt, been a good deal of local prejudice. Even before Governor Hennessy arrived there a public meeting had been held at which very violent language had been used. At the same time I thought it was not consistent with my duty to avoid bringing the question before the Legislature. I did not see that there was any more cause for apprehension than in former years; and on reading these Papers I think your Lordships will admit that I exercised all the caution and forbearance in the matter which a Minister ought to exercise. I desired not to press the proposal, but that it should grow from the spontaneous action of the Legislature, and I was at least entitled to suppose that the Legislature would give a fair and patient hearing to any proposals which the Governor, as the Representative of the Queen, might make. I will only add on this part of the subject that there is a point which, perhaps your Lordships would do well to bear in mind —namely, that this question has never been discussed by the Legislature of Barbadoes. There has been a great deal of violent language used in public meetings and otherwise with respect to it, but there has never been any discussion in the Legislature. Passing from this, I would allude to the changes which have been made in the Executive Council—reference to them will be found all through the Blue Book, and they have been made a great matter of complaint. I desire to explain what the change really amounts to, and how little foundation there is for the charges that are based upon it. Until within the last year or so the Executive Council and the Legislative Council were composed of identically the same persons; they sat at a different time and in a different place, but they were identically the same body discharging different functions. But that being so, and part of the body being composed of unofficial members, there could be none of that unreserve and that confidential communication passing between the Governor as the head of the Executive and the Ministers who had to carry out his measures which are essential to the conduct of any Government at all. I am not aware of any other single colony or of any civilized State in which such an arrangement exists, as that the members of the Governor's Cabinet should be other than those who are his confidential advisers and persons whom he trusts. I am bound to add the exceptional system adopted in Barbadoes had worked badly and had led to many difficulties and evils; and, therefore, when a new Governor went out to that island I thought that provision should be made to secure that the Executive Council should henceforth be composed exclusively of his confidential advisers. That is the sum total of the change which has been made, and the whole of the offence which I have given. I pass now to the charges which have been brought against Governor Hennessy. The first charge against him was that he addressed violent and intemperate language to the House of Assembly on the 3rd of March; the second was that he, having received my instructions as Secretary of State, and knowing that it was my desire that Federation should not be forced upon the inhabitants of Barbadoes, had in defiance of those instructions sent secret emissaries through the island to scatter abroad among the negro population his views respecting Federation; and the third was that, not content with these means of spreading his views, he had resorted to extraordinary methods of propagating them by presiding at negro meetings and giving dinners to negro deputations. It would, perhaps, have been well had Mr. Hennessy remembered the old maxim about—

> "Spargere voces
> In vulgum ambiguas."

With regard to the first charge, I think that Mr. Hennessy is open to some blame. I candidly confess that I think his language to the Assembly was somewhat indiscreet. No doubt he used words which might be construed by an excitable negro population in a very different sense from that in the mind of the speaker. It is quite true that other Governors who had preceded Mr. Hennessy had used equally objectionable language; but that is no excuse for his having followed their example. It is not because one man has committed an indiscretion that his successor should make a similar mistake. The effect of language is altered also by time and place. Thus, what may be uttered without any ill effects in Pall Mall may have grave results when spoken in the West Indies in the hearing of a negro population. I think, therefore, that had Mr. Hennessy more carefully measured his words on the occasion referred to, he would have shown more discretion than he did. But, at the same time, having said this much, I think that I have stated all that can be substantiated against Mr. Hennessy. And I wish once more to repeat that, so far as the actual language goes, I do not think it was in excess of much that had been uttered by his predecessors in the government of the island. When, however, I come to the second charge—namely, that he sent emissaries throughout the country in order to propagate his own opinions, that involves a totally different question. I must say at once that I do not see in these Papers one particle of reasonable evidence in support of it. On the contrary, I see more than once a flat and an absolute contradiction of it. What are the words which Mr. Hennessy himself uses with regard to it? He says, in his despatch of the 30th of May—

> "I have never employed, directly or indirectly, any paid or unpaid emissaries in favour of Confederation. I never attended a meeting about Confederation in any part of the Island, or in any way encouraged or countenanced agitation on the subject. I have never made any criticism on the Legislature or institutions of Barbadoes, or delivered addresses on that or any other subject that I have not, in due course, laid before your Lordship in official despatches."

I deem it due to Mr. Hennessy that I should read to your Lordships the flat contradiction which he has given to the charge; and no one can reasonably doubt, there being no evidence in support of the charge and there being this flat contradiction of it, that Mr. Hennessy stands entirely acquitted with regard to it. Referring to the third charge—that he entertained negroes at banquets and presided over negro meetings—your Lordships will find in Mr. Hennessy's despatches very careful and elaborate answers to it, which seem to reduce it to a complete absurdity. It appears from those despatches that on one occasion he directed his butler to give a few negroes who had called at his house as a deputation some little refreshment, and that he had on one occasion addressed a few words to a single negro in his own grounds. Under these circumstances, therefore, Mr. Hennessy stands entirely absolved from the two latter charges. This is how the matter stands with regard to his conduct before the riots occurred; but now let me ask your Lordships to consider what was Mr. Hennessy's conduct during the riots. Your Lordships will remember that he had been denounced with violence in the public newspapers and at public meetings, and that charges had been made against him by agents sent home to denounce him to the Secretary of State, and that he had been constantly threatened with assassination. On the other hand, it should be remembered that he had been continually urged by excited persons to shoot and hang and to proclaim martial law, and thus to revive a state of panic and terror, which the noble Lord opposite will remember was an unfortunate incident in the Jamaica disturbances. Mr. Hennessy, however, kept his head clear and cool throughout. He declined to be a party to such acts—and he even refused permission to the special constables to carry fire-arms. During the whole of the disturbances not one shot was fired by the troops, and whatever lives were lost were lost through the action of the police. In other matters also he acted with the utmost impartiality. He allowed the Crown officers to vote against him on the question of Federation; he gave leave of absence to the persons who were delegated to visit this country to denounce his conduct to the Secretary of State, and he gave leave to the Assembly to discuss the question of his recall. An Assembly debating the question of the recall of their Governor is a case almost without precedent in colonial history. Probably there are not many Governors who would have shown equal coolness and forbearance with Mr. Hennessy in such a matter. Further than that, he discountenanced all Petitions which were presented in favour of his particular views; and throughout a long period his conduct was uniformly courteous and conciliatory, though that was not the characteristic of the language of his opponents. On this part of the case, therefore, not only do I acquit Mr. Hennessy of all blame, but I think that he is entitled to very great praise. The next question that arises is as to the course which Her Majesty's Government have thought proper to take in the matter. The Assembly passed a resolution a short time since, in which they prayed for two things—first for the recall of Mr. Hennessy, and, secondly, for the issuing of a Commission. Now, after what I have said with regard to Mr. Hennessy, your Lordships will agree with me that to recall Mr. Hennessy is simply out of the question. It would be a base and monstrous injustice to him. I do not deny—although I admit it with great pain—that the relations between Mr. Hennessy and the Assembly and some other classes of people in Barbadoes have become greatly strained; and of this there is one instance in the Blue Book, which certainly is without precedent. It appears that on the occasion of the Queen's Birthday, Mr. Hennessy, according to the ordinary custom, gave a formal banquet, to which he invited the leading persons in the colony; but I regret to say that with two exceptions the leading members of the Assembly declined to accept the invitations they received, and fixed another day, on which they gave a dinner on their own account. I think that in doing this they acted in deplorable taste, to say the least of it. If the Assembly or any other political Body in Barbadoes desired to put themselves at variance with the Governor, they should have adopted the ordinary political means of doing so, without dragging Her Majesty's name into the controversy, and should have acted in political warfare like political men and not in the fractious temper of mere children. Looking to the extreme tension of the relations between Mr. Hennessy and the Assembly, I have been urged, both by the opponents and friends of Mr. Hennessy, that his removal from the colony would be desirable. I think that tension of feeling is very much to be regretted; but surely at such a moment as this, I am precluded from entertaining this suggestion. Whatever may be done hereafter, I cannot consent to remove Mr. Hennessy now. To do so would be to pass an indirect censure upon him; and it would seem as though Her Majesty's Government had accorded a victory to those who have carried on this warfare in a manner which I think they, upon reflection, will be the first to regret. A second point urged by the Assembly is, that a Commission should be issued. Now, there are two kinds of Commissions. There is a Commission such as was issued in the case of Jamaica, and there is a kind of Commission appointed in the case of the Mauritius. The first was a Commission issued to inquire into the disturbances in Jamaica, and the amount of blame which might attach to one side or the other in connection with them. Now, I see no reason why we should incur the expense of raking up these causes of quarrel in Barbadoes and in provoking recriminations of the bitterest kind, and in keeping alive that state of feeling that has prevailed. Let the storm which has been raging subside, and then it will be full time to think of any further steps. There is a second class of Commission—namely, a Commission to inquire into the condition of classes, the interests of the Island, and the best way of promoting them; the question of the franchise, the labour question, emigration, and many other matters which make for the welfare of Barbadoes; and I do not say that hereafter it may not be desirable and may not be the duty of the Government to issue such a Commission. At this moment, however, I do not think it would be needed; and as regards the first kind of Commission I think it would be highly objectionable. My Lords, I can hardly bring these remarks to an end without adding some expression of opinion as to that which has been brought indirectly to light by those disturbances—namely, the present state of the colony. I am quite aware that in entering upon this subject, however briefly, I walk upon delicate ground as far as the feelings of the Barbadians are concerned. I am not insensible to many points which may be urged in their favour—their attachment to their ancient Constitution, their loyalty to the Crown, and other estimable qualities. At the same time I should be untrue to the facts if I were not to state that, in my opinion, the present condition of the Island as revealed by these Papers is one by no means satisfactory. The condition of the peasantry is in itself an unsatisfactory, and, I venture to say, an unsound condition. The population is, no doubt, redundant. It is consequently paid in very low wages, and even these wages, I suspect, are sometimes liable to various stoppages and deductions. I doubt whether the law in some instances does not press with a certain amount of severity upon the peasantry. All these points have at different times been pressed not merely by Mr. Hennessy in these despatches, but by successive Governors—some of them men whose affection for the Barbadian Constitution cannot for one moment be questioned. I go a step further, and I doubt whether many public institutions of the colony are in at all a satisfactory condition. Take the case of the prisons. In some of those Papers will be found a despatch written in 1872 by my noble Friend (the Earl of Kimberley). I cite it as an illustration and nothing more. A statement as to the deplorable condition of the gaols in Barbadoes had been sent to my noble Friend, who forwarded it to the Governor for the time being for a report. The answer was that, though, no doubt, more or less coloured, there was a good deal to complain of. In 1867, Sir James Walker, who certainly had no prejudice against Barbadians or Barbadian institutions, twice called the attention of the Legislature to the state of the prisons. No notice was taken of his Message, and he made some very severe comments upon the subject. All through 1871-2 the late Governor, Sir Rawson Rawson, called attention to the same subject. In 1873 a Commission of both Houses was appointed. In 1874 a Vote for a sum of money was read a first time; but delays occurred, the whole question was shelved, and the gaols remained very much in the same condition. Take another case—that of prison discipline, and the punishments inflicted for prison offences. It is impossible not to be startled by their character and number. On the average of the last six years the floggings in the Barbadian prisons appeared to be 20 times as numerous as those of all the prisons of Jamaica. During the first 10 months of 1875, 50 persons were flogged in Barbadian prisons—while on the other hand, not one single case was recorded in St. Lucia. Grenada, or St. Vincent: and the total prison punishments in Barbadoes during last year, including other punishments than flogging, amount to the enormous figure of 2,197. I can only say that either the population of Barbadoes is of a very much worse character than that of any other of the West India islands, or the fault is in the system, and many more prison floggings are inflicted than are necessary. I do not say that the Assembly or any class of persons in Barbadoes is responsible for this state of things. I merely say it indicates—wherever the fault may lie—an amount of unsoundness which requires the best attention of the Barbadian Legislature. One more case will be enough. It shall be the case of some public institutions. Feeling uneasy, for some reason, as to the provision for idiots and imbeciles, I requested an explanation from Mr. Hennessy as to the character and amount of such provision. I am told there is none. I do not think this is creditable to a colony. Further I find there is an institution for that great scourge of the West Indies, leprosy, and this institution is administered by a Board, if I mistake not, appointed by the Assembly. Now, official evidence shows that during a space of five or six years—I am speaking from memory, but I believe I am correct —this institution was never visited by the members of that Board, and that, in fact, no one ever visited it excepting the chaplain and the surgeon. There again, I say, though individuals, perhaps, are not liable to blame, the public institutions of the Colony require very careful reconsideration by the Governing Body. I wish that in recent transactions the Assembly could have brought itself to believe that co-operation with the Executive Government upon questions of this sort was not only its duty, but was also expedient. There have been two or three cases, however, which have forced painfully upon me a different conclusion. Since these disturbances the Governor has pressed most earnestly upon the Assembly the necessity of increasing the police force; and no one can doubt for a moment the reasonableness or the necessity of such a proposal. But the Bill for this purpose has been practically ignored by the Assembly. I myself felt the subject to be of such importance that I telegraphed to the Governor, and requested that it might be brought before the Assembly; but I believe that up to this time all the proposals for increasing the police force have been in vain. Meanwhile, your Lordships will remember that the troops in the colony are still quartered about in the different plantations to maintain peace and order. In 1867 the Governor of that day attributed a great part of the disturbances, and the most serious part, to the absence of an active police force, and I consider I should have been wanting in my duty if I had refrained from urging the Assembly to take the same course now. There are other matters which the Assembly will do well to consider. It is not worthy of the Legislature of any British colony to refuse to pay a Bill for telegraphs passing between the colony and the Imperial Government upon their own domestic concerns. It is not worthy of them to spend their time in personal discussions and recriminations when questions of grave importance are still to be dealt with. The House will observe that throughout the despatches stress is laid on the importance of maintaining the Constitution. I am not insensible of the value of the colonial Constitution; but when they say it is identical in fundamental principles with the English Constitution, I feel bound to point out how absolutely they misapprehend the case. In fact, the principles of their Constitution are practically the reverse of ours. The Executive Government is separate from and generally, I am sorry to say—of late years, at all events—at variance with, the Legislative Power. When a Money Vote is proposed, so far from its being proposed simply on the responsibility of a Minister, it is proposed on the responsibility really of a private Member. The greater part of the business of the colony is conducted by means of Committees or Boards formed out of the Assembly, who spend the money and appropriate it as they think right. That is a fusion of legislative and executive duties such as we have no notion of in this country. Again, the franchise in Barbadoes is of a most limited character. Out of a population of 160,000 or more, there are only something like 1,200 or 1,300 electors; and, to crown all, the Dissolution, instead of occurring at intervals of seven years, must, as a matter of necessity, occur annually at Barbadoes. Under these circumstances it seems idle to say that the principles of the Barbadoes Constitution, whatever value they may have in an historical point of view, are similar or analogous to those of the Constitution of this country. I have now gone through the different points which I have thought necessary to touch upon. I have certainly no wish to seem to press hardly on the Legislature or Constitution of Barbadoes, but I should be wrong were I to refrain from saying that I do feel considerable anxiety. If the present state of things were to continue, I foresee trouble in the future. I certainly am not one who would in any way desire unnecessarily to interfere with an ancient Constitution in which the colonists take a pride. I have always objected to such interference, and I conceive it can only be sanctioned by the facts and necessities of the case. As far as possible I would trust to the good sense and the patriotic feeling of the Legislature of the Colony. Possibly, one of the reasons why they took the view which they unfortunately have taken is that they were hardly aware of what the feeling of Her Majesty's successive Governments has been on the subject, and how strong has been the opinion of the public here in England. My Lords, the mere form of Constitution seems to me to be a secondary matter. An anomalous Constitution, such as, I am bound to say the Barbadoes Constitution is, may be worked, and even worked admirably, by men of good sense, right feeling, and patriotic impulse. On the other hand, if the Constitution were perfect, it might be badly worked. I take it to be of the substance of a good Constitution that there should be good government; that there should be equality for all in the eye of the law, and that all the securities for the well-being of all classes of the community should be fully provided for as far as a Constitution can provide them. I trust that the Barbadoes Legislature will accept this view of the matter; that they will co-operate with Her Majesty's Government, as Her Majesty's Government are most truly and sincerely desirous to co-operate with them; and that they will address themselves with all their patriotic feeling, with all the ability they possess, and with all their earnestness to the task, and the very responsible task, which, I need not for one moment attempt to conceal, lies before them.

Viscount CARDWELL: I am sorry my noble Friend the late Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Kimberley) is quite unable to appear here to-night. I have had some communication with him, and I come here to express on his part, and on my own, sentiments very much in accordance with those stated by the noble Earl opposite. With regard to the proposed alteration of the Legislative Council, so that it shall not be the exact correspondent of the Executive Council, I think it is absolutely necessary that you should not have in the deliberative Council the very same persons who compose the Executive Council — that the Executive Council should contain only one confidential adviser of the Governor, and that you should have in the Executive Council the opponents of the Governor, and that the government should be carried on by them is an evidently impracticable arrangement. With regard to Governor Hennessy, the policy of which he has been the advocate was first, I think, distinctly laid down in a despatch by my noble Friend the Earl of Kimberley. The time of bringing it forward and the person by whom it was to be brought forward were the choice of my noble Friend opposite; and I bear in mind that he pointed out to Governor Hennessy that he ought not to press a change in the position of Barbadoes and the other Islands against the wish of the people of Barbadoes themselves. I am disposed to agree with what has been said by my noble Friend opposite in regard to Governor Hennessy. It was unfortunate that that gentleman used the phrases and assumed the tone which he appears to have done in the first instance; but with regard to his subsequent conduct I am ready to admit all that has been said about him by my noble Friend opposite; and certainly I have not the slightest inclination to apologize for or extenuate in any degree the violent opposition shown to him by many who have taken part in the government of Barbadoes, and who showed disrespect to the Sovereign in order to express their disapproval of the Governor's conduct. I have listened with considerable surprise to the scheme just propounded by the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon), because I should have thought that it would have come more naturally in the form of a despatch from the Secretary of State to be laid on the

Table of Parliament and considered by the constituted authorities in Barbadoes, rather than in a speech delivered by the Secretary of State at the close of the Session, and, as far as I am aware, not in the presence of any individual who has a personal knowledge of the state of Barbadoes, or the views which any of these people might wish to lay before your Lordships. Therefore the proposal must be taken as a grave censure of all the authorities in Barbadoes made by the Secretary of State, who has given them no opportunity whatever of expressing anything, either in disproof of any facts which have been stated, or in mitigation of any blame laid upon them; or, in short, of exercising the common right of Englishmen to be heard in their own defence.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My noble Friend will remember that almost every, if not every, word of what I said on that subject is to be found in these Blue Books to which I desire to call attention.

VISCOUNT CARDWELL: I am not sure that that alters the case very much. We have been lectured during the last few days for bringing forward Questions before this House without having a Motion before it; and if the rule is to be observed by those who sit on this side of the House, and are not burdened by any special responsibility, I think it ought also to be observed by those who sit on the other side, and are charged with all the responsibilties of the Executive Government. For myself, I have not the slightest desire to take the part of any of these gentlemen in Barbadoes—of whom I happen to know nothing. If one-tenth of the impeachment made against them by the Secretary of State is founded on fact, all I can say is, whether it be in the form of Confederation or not, some change in the government of Barbadoes is absolutely necessary, and must be forced upon them without much delay. Such a state of things as has been described by the noble Earl cannot be permitted to continue. With regard to Governor Hennessy, it is of course impossible that my noble Friend can recall him after the verdict which he has arrived at on his conduct. It is intended, however, I presume, to provide some other position for Governor Hennessy without any protracted delay—for I think he is, at present, in a position which must be very unsatisfactory to himself. To recall him would be to imply blame which it is not intended to imply; but I think there should be a separation between Governor Hennessy and Barbadoes on the ground of incompatibility of temper. There is no cause in this instance for such a Commission as we were compelled to send out to Jamaica. A Constitution which might be suited to a great and powerful country might be utterly unfitted for a small island, over-populated and in a condition of great poverty, and the Government might be quite right in not appointing such a Commission as in the case of Jamaica; but after the statement of my noble Friend as to the condition of the colony, it is quite clear that that condition cannot be allowed to continue many months, and I therefore earnestly hope that when Parliament again assembles my noble Friend will be in a position to lay some proposal before the House for immediately putting an end to it.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, that whilst the planters attributed the agitation in Barbadoes to the Governor, and the Anti-Slavery Society believed it was attributable to tortuous proceedings on the part of the planters, he believed that it was chiefly caused by the discussions of the Anti-Confederation Defence Association—it being a fact that the colonial newspapers had lowered their prices with the avowed object of convincing the lower classes that confederation would not be a benefit. *The West Indian* was a very fair and moderate paper, and it contained so many letters taking a view opposed to its own, that it would increase the excitement; whilst *The Globe* and *Agricultural Reporter* were very exaggerated. The unseemly conduct of the Assembly in carrying their disputes into the celebration of the Queen's birthday, and their debating the recall of the Governor, reminded him of those Levantine Consuls who used to haul down their flags and break off their relations with the local authorities without orders from their Embassies. But there was some excuse for the Barbadian colonists in the bad precedents which they had; for he found in Sir Robert Schomburgk's History of Barbadoes that, about 80 years ago, a man of colour named Denny had shot a poor white man and was found guilty by the jury. The Chief Justice Gibbes who tried him animadverted on the bias shown by the jury, and made representations on behalf of the prisoner to the Governor. The King's pleasure was taken, and the sentence commuted to perpetual banishment. The prisoner was sent on board a Government brig which got under weigh, when a band of colonists, many of them of the more respectable class, rushed to Rickett's battery and fired upon the brig, and got possession of the prisoner; the tumult was appeased by reading the letter of the Duke of Portland. But a committee of the colonists called upon the Governor to suspend Mr. Gibbes from all his official employments. Mr. Gibbes went to England and obtained a *mandamus* for his restoration to office, shortly after which he resigned. In his judgment the noble Earl the Secretary of State had exercised a wise discretion in refusing to send a Royal Commission to Barbadoes, notwithstanding that both the West Indian Committee and the Anti-Slavery Society had expressed the wish that he should do so; because such a Commission would have the effect of re-opening the late discussion and reviving the excitement, by taking evidence with regard to the recent disturbances. But he would ask his noble Friend to give his favourable consideration as to whether it would not be desirable that he should send a clerk of the Colonial Office in whose department Barbadoes was situated to acquire some local knowledge of that colony, and whether it might not be desirable for the Secretary of State to take the same measures whenever any colony was in difficulties?—following in this the example of the Foreign Office, which frequently sent one of its clerks to assist one of Her Majesty's Legations abroad, to the mutual benefit of the Legation thus assisted and the Staff of the Foreign Office, which thereby acquired useful experience and local knowledge. The conflicting statements as to pauperism in Barbadoes showed the difficulty of estimating the value of reports without local knowledge. The project of Confederation might well be dropped for the present, since most of the advantages of this scheme had been already secured, as had been pointed out by Governor Hennessy, in his despatch to the Secretary of State, which he communicated to the Barbadoes Legislature on the 1st of February last. The word "intercolonial" had already been adopted by the Barbadians, and would cover all that they objected to under the word Confederation. He would suggest that free passages should be given to labourers from Barbadoes going to the neighbouring islands, half the cost to be borne by Barbadoes and half by the Colony receiving the labourers. Emigration Acts had been passed in Barbadoes, and sums voted for this purpose, but not with sufficient system; this course was not open to the objections which were made to promoting coolie immigration by votes out of West Indian taxation, since in this case the poorer class of taxpayers would profit by it. The same measure of free passages might also be advantageously applied to the students of the Windward Islands who might come to the schools and colleges of Barbadoes, which were better than any that existed or that would be likely to be established in the other islands, and in that manner the inhabitants of the Windward Islands would not feel so much jealousy of the educational advantages possessed by Barbadoes. There was also a suggestion which Mr. Duffield, a gentleman who had long resided in the Colonies, was very anxious should be made to the Secretary of State, and the favourable consideration which his noble Friend had given to the plan of a proposed Colonial Museum emboldened him to make it—namely, that the Secretary of State should send out an inexpensive scientific Commission of one or two persons to report upon the vegetable products of the West Indies, of which many valuable kinds were unknown, and which might be usefully exported to Canada and to England. The mission of Mr. Markham by the India Office to South America to obtain cinchona plants formed a precedent for this suggestion.

Lord O'HAGAN: My Lords, I cannot refrain from expressing my entire approval of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, and the great pleasure with which I have heard the characteristically just and generous statement of the noble Earl, the Secretary for the Colonies. Of his general policy in relation to Barbadoes enough has been said by the noble Lords who have preceded me. But I desire to add one word, on behalf of Mr. Hennessy, in whose proceedings I have not taken less interest, and in whose vindication I have not felt less satisfaction, because, whilst I sat with him in the House of Commons, he was the active and often the troublesome opponent of the Party and the principles to which I am attached. He may, as was said by the noble Earl, have spoken indiscreetly; but he was placed in circumstances of extreme difficulty, in which few men could have hoped for a perfect immunity from error, and, looking to the Correspondence before us, I think it affords the strongest evidence that he possessed throughout the serious trials to which he was subjected a cool head, a brave heart, and an honest purpose. He refused to permit any of those acts of violence and cruelty to which panic has so often urged individuals and masses of men. He resisted a powerful combination, acting too much in the spirit of ascendancy, which has shown itself equally reckless in its accusations and indifferent to the interests of humanity and justice. He deliberately declined to allow his Executive Council to adopt the unconstitutional courses which had been pursued in a neighbouring island, and to his fairness and moderation it is directly attributable that the scenes of blood and terror which disgraced Jamaica were not enacted in Barbadoes. I sincerely rejoice that the Government, in spite of unscrupulous and persistent calumny, has recognized his merit, aud preserved to the public service an able administrator, whose career will be one of usefulness and honour.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 1st August, 1876.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading*— Expiring Laws Continuance * [281].

First Reading — Waste Lands and Peasants Dwellings (Ireland) * [280].

Referred to Select Committee — Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artizans and Labourers Dwellings * [260].

Considered as amended— Pollution of Rivers [276].

Third Reading—Bishopric of Truro * [185]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bingley, &c.) * [255]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Chelmsford, &c.) * [256], and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

POOR LAW — BATH BOARD OF GUARDIANS.—QUESTION.

DR. LUSH asked the President of the Local Government Board, If the scheme lately adopted by the Bath Board of Guardians with reference to the salary and duties of the workhouse medical officer has been submitted to him; and, if that portion of it by which the duties of supplying wine and brandy to the sick pauper inmates for an annual sum of £30 is imposed upon the medical officer (the recent annual cost having been stated to be £70) has received his approval?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, that the portion of the scheme to which the hon. Member referred had not received his approval; and that since it was submitted to the Local Government Board, he had received information from the Guardians to the effect that they had rescinded that part of the scheme.

ARMY MEDICAL REPORTS. QUESTION.

MR. GIBSON asked the Secretary of State for War, Why copies of the last (the 16th) volume of the Army Medical Reports have not been presented to the Army Medical Officers; whether it has not hitherto been the invariable practice to supply the said Reports on publication to the Army Medical Officers; and, whether there is any, and, if so, what reason for a change in the practice heretofore observed?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, that the supply of these Reports had been stopped on the suggestion of the Army Medical Controller. Copies were now sent to all the general hospital stations, where they would be preserved for consultation.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.—QUESTION.

MR. SMYTH (for General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether, under 23 and 24 Vic. c. 51, the penalty of £20 for default for non-rendering Returns of Rates, Taxes, Tolls, and Dues, and Accounts of the Expenditure has ever been enforced against the various authorities, Corporations, Boards, Inspectors, and others who have neglected to render their accounts; and, whether, in future Abstracts of Local Rates, &c. required by that Act to be laid before Parliament, a list of all defaulting authorities will be published, with a statement of the penalties enforced?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, the penalty had never been enforced since the duty of collection was transferred to the Local Government office four years ago. A threat of legal proceedings had always been sufficient to secure a Return.

FIJI—THE EPIDEMIC.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he has concurred in the opinion expressed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in a letter to the Admiralty dated December 3, 1875, as to the share of the responsibility of the captain and medical officer of H.M.S. "Dido" for the introduction of measles into the Fijian Islands, and the consequent loss of life in those Islands; and, if so, what course has been taken by the Admiralty with reference to those officers?

Mr. HUNT, in reply, said, his noble Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies had stated, in the letter referred to, that he was unable to arrive at any decided conclusion as to the proportion in which the blame for the grave neglect incurred in this lamentable affair should be divided as between the naval and the colonial officers, though he could not admit that the captain and medical officer of the *Dido* had cleared themselves of the charge of having failed to give the fullest notice by the ordinary means of warning of the fact that there was an outbreak of measles on board the vessel. His noble Friend then went on to say that it the was an unfortunate omission not to fly the yellow flag while the ship was in the harbour. With regard to the share of the responsibility, he could not concur with his noble Friend. He was of opinion that the greater portion of the responsibility rested upon the colonial authorities. In reference to flying the yellow flag, that was not required by the regulations, when a vessel with measles on board came into a home port, unless there was a special Order in Council that the yellow flag should be hoisted. Nor was it required in a foreign port, unless the quarantine regulations prescribed it. He was not aware that there were any such regulations in Fiji. Directly the *Dido* came into harbour she was boarded by Mr. Layard, the Administrator. The captain was on the watch for him, and informed him, as he came up to the ship's side, that the doctor wished to see him. The Administrator went down into the cabin, and the doctor informed him that there were measles on board. So that the captain and the doctor took steps to inform the colonial authorities of that fact; but, unfortunately, none of the parties concerned seemed to be aware of the serious nature of the disease when imported fresh among the Natives. The Admiralty had informed the doctor and captain that they disapproved of their conduct in not having treated the matter more seriously. The disease was treated on board as merely a child's disease. No proper precautions were taken to prevent its communication with the shore, and the consequence was a lamentable loss of life among the Natives of the Fiji Islands. The mischief seemed to have arisen in a great degree from ignorance rather than inattention or neglect; and therefore the Board had not thought it their duty to take more serious notice of the case than by the letter which had been written to the parties.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, referring to the difference of opinion between the First Lord and the Colonial Secretary, asked, whether the right hon. Gentleman would lay on the Table any communications he made on the subject to the officers of the *Dido?*

Mr. HUNT said, he had no objection to lay on the Table certain Papers relating to the subject.

THE KEYNSHAM CASE.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, If he can inform the House what is the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown with respect to the Keynsham case?

VISCOUNT SANDON: We have referred the question of the right hon. Gentleman, as to the legality of the action of the Department in this case, as he desired, to the Law Officers of the Crown, and they report that the Education Department, in refusing an annual grant to the Keynsham British School, have not acted illegally. But as doubts have been raised respecting the propriety of the action we have taken, without a special provision in the Code to that effect, the Government is of opinion that the Education Department, in administering the Parliamentary grant, ought to be distinctly empowered to exercise its discretion in order to prevent the multiplication of unnecessary schools, with a view to secure both economy and efficiency, especially in cases where a locality has already, at the bidding of the Department, put itself to the expense of providing the necessary school accommodation. We propose, therefore, to follow the precedent of the provision already made in the Scotch Code (Article 7. B); and we shall lay upon the Table of both Houses a Minute, which, in accordance with the rule which Section 98 of the Act of 1870 lays down with regard to school board districts, will secure that the practice of the Education Department shall be made uniform throughout the country in the case of schools where annual grants have not previously been made.

MR. W. E. FORSTER inquired, whether the noble Lord would have any objection to lay on the Table the Copy of the case sent to the Law Officers of the Crown, and of their opinion upon it? With regard to the proposed Minute, he supposed that if it were laid on the Table now it would have no legal power unless the House continued to sit for another month.

VISCOUNT SANDON declined to produce a Copy of the Opinion of the Law Officers, because to do so would be contrary to custom. He was aware that the Minute could not become law till after it had been on the Table a month.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

EDUCATION—TEACHERS OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. W. E. FORSTER rose to call the attention of the House to the alteration made this year in the Education Code, by which young, untrained teachers of Public Elementary Schools were enabled to obtain a certificate without examination. He could not very well have objected to the Code earlier, because it was laid on the Table only 10 days before it came into operation, instead of a month, as required by the Act. When the Act of 1870 was passed, it was foreseen that there would be a great demand for teachers, and arrangements were made that teachers above 35 years of age, of good character, and who had been teaching for 10 years, should be admitted to a third class certificate. Many men and women, who were very good teachers, could hardly at that age be expected to submit to an examination, and a concession was made in favour of admitting such persons to the third class. This concession was looked upon at the time with great doubt. The noble Lord (Viscount Sandon) in 1874 made a further concession. He admitted males at 35 and females at 30 to the third class. He (Mr. W. E. Forster) had not objected to that alteration. But a further extension was made by the code of this year, by which teachers of 25 years of age, who had worked for five years, were admitted to the third class, and became certificated teachers. His principal objection to the change was that it would strike a serious blow at the certificate system. The supply of teachers now was much more satisfactory than it was in 1870, and certainly did not, as had been stated, fall short of the demand. There was one certificated teacher to every 83 children, and a prospect of a still greater supply. The increase of assistant teachers was 96 per cent. The great source of supply of teachers was the pupil-teachers. These had increased 127 per cent. The principle of payment by results was open to the abuse of cramming in the hands of incompetent teachers, and the certificate system was their only security against that abuse. There could be no doubt that, as a general rule, the same results would be attained more satisfactorily by trained and certificated teachers than by teachers obtaining their certificates in this way. He hoped, at all events, care would be taken to guard against the temptation to conduct large schools by two or more of this class of teachers instead of by duly certificated teachers with a proper staff of pupil-teachers. Assuming that the change was designed to meet the necessities of poor schools, he confessed he would rather have met them by a direct grant.

VISCOUNT SANDON admitted the importance of allowing the Code to lie on the Table for a month before it came into operation, and reminded the right hon. Gentleman that this year he had said he would not object to any opposition of which Notice was given within a month of the time that the Code was issued. The position in the Code of these third class teachers was only a temporary one, and would be re-considered in 1879. The Department was herein only following a precedent set by the Marquess of Ripon for the sake of the teachers, but now followed for the sake of the schools and scholars. Whatever might be the figures with regard to the supply of teachers, the Department were practically face to face with the fact that persons often advertised for teachers, and that no teachers were forthcoming; and, as more hamlet schools were coming forward for the Government grant a still greater want of teachers was likely to be felt. He fully admitted that it was undesirable to strike a blow at the certificated teachers, and he had always said that the key to educational progress was our having an adequate supply of thoroughly efficient teachers. The question was whether these teachers were fit for the work or not, and it was to be remembered that they would only teach in very small schools. He had been told by Her Majesty's Inspectors that they knew of better teachers for this purpose than the certificated teachers, and they would come in under this rule. The question of their efficiency would be entirely in the hands of Her Majesty's Inspectors, who would have to certify that the teachers were efficient, and the whole question of what class of teachers should be admitted rested with the Inspectors. It was the decided wish of the Department—and of this the Inspectors were fully aware—that no teachers should be admitted for these third class certificates unless they were thoroughly efficient. No doubt the certificated teachers complained of the rule as an invasion of their privileges, and he had received representations from them to this effect. He could not admit the principle upon which these representations were founded. The certificated teachers had received a very large amount of State aid as pupil-teachers and in Training Colleges, and when they had obtained the certificate the male teachers earned £80 a-year and the women £60 a-year. He could by no means admit that these teachers had anything in the nature of a vested right which entitled them to shut out others from the profession. The Department were bound to look at the matter from the point of view of the schools and the scholars, of course taking care that no injustice was done to the teachers. The new rule was adopted with a view to a distinct emergency, and the Inspectors would take very good care not to admit persons who were not thoroughly up to their work. It was, moreover, intended to confine the new third class certificates to the teachers in schools of less than 60 scholars.

SUPPLY.—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.—VOTE 1.—PUBLIC EDUCATION.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £1,107,055, to complete the sum for Public Education in England and Wales.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, that hon. Members had heard so much about education this Session that he would not trespass upon the time of the Committee by going into the general question of education. He had, in fact, on bringing in the Education Bill, given a review of the condition of education in this country. He would, therefore, only trouble the House with a few figures in order to explain the Vote. The Committee would see that the Education Estimate for England for 1876-7—namely, the year ending April, 1877—was £158,492 in excess of that for 1875-6. The Vote for the present year was £1,707,055, while that for last year was £1,548,563. With regard to the cause of the excess, the real increase had been in the annual grants to day and evening schools, which amounted to £166,976. On the other hand, there had been a decrease in the building grants of £24,000, and these grants, he was happy to say, were very rapidly coming to an end. There had been an important increase in the number of Her Majesty's Inspectors; but he was certain the Committee would share the satisfaction he felt at provision having been made for 15 additional Inspectors and 15 Inspectors' assistants. It was important that the inspection of our schools should be well done, and the country now possessed a very remarkable staff of Inspectors—men of great intellectual power and high capacity. He was most anxious that the character of the Inspectors should be kept up, and that there should be a sufficient number, so that they might not hurry over their inspection, and might give the schools the benefit of their oversight and experience. He was also anxious that in all cases, if possible, a second visit in the year should be paid to each school. This visit was made without notice, so that the Inspector might see the school in its normal state, and it was to be regarded as a visit of encouragement, and not undertaken for the purpose of routing out irregularities. The teachers themselves highly appreciated this second visit in the year, because it enabled them to talk over matters with the Inspector, and the increase in the number of Inspectors would enable many more of these second visits to be paid. The grants were estimated to be paid upon 2,071,997 children, being 109,000 more than last year, or 5·5 per cent increase above last year. The rate of grant for 1875-6 was 12*s.* 9*d.* per head; the estimated grant for 1876-7 was 13*s.* 8*d.*, being an increase of 11*d.*, which would accrue partly from general progress and partly from changes in the Code. The Committee might feel interested in knowing the rate of progress—During the five years up to the 31st of August, 1870, the scholars' register had increased 36·5 per cent, or 453,000, while for the five years up to August 31, 1875, it had increased 62 per cent, or 1,051,000. This was a very satisfactory increase so far as the register went. He now came to the average attendance—For the five years ending August 31, 1870, the average attendance had increased 35·9 per cent, or 304,000, while for the five years up to August 31, 1875, it had increased 59·4 per cent, or 684,000. The ratio of average attendance to the numbers on the register was in 1870 68·06 per cent; in 1875 it was 66·9 per cent, being a decrease in 1875 of 1·16 per cent. That was accounted for by the number of rough children who were swept into the schools by the action of the school boards. The number of day schools inspected for annual grants was in 1870 8,279; in 1875, 13,217, being an increase in five years of 4,938 schools, while the increase in the five years preceding 1870 was only 1,912. That was certainly a very satisfactory result. There were now 17,323 voluntary schools, being an increase of 966 over last year, and they afforded accommodation for over 2,772,000 children, being an increase of 145,000 over last year. Of board schools they had 1,922, being an increase of 663 over last year, and they afforded accommodation for 387,000 children, being an increase over last year of 141,000. Altogether the general advance was as much as they could possibly hope for, and he trusted that next year they would have a still greater advance to show. With respect to teachers, they had now got 20,940, being an increase of 2,226 as compared with last year, and the pupil-teachers numbered 29,940, being an increase of 2,636. With respect to evening schools, he regretted to say there was a slight falling off in their number. He could not account for the decrease in schools to which personally he attached very great importance, more especially as he had hoped by a relaxation of the number of days they were obliged to be open, and allowing another class of teachers to come in, to secure an increase in their number. He assured the Committee that he would watch the matter with anxiety, and he trusted they would have a better account to give in the coming year. The work, he thought, was now in a satisfactory position, and by keeping everyone up to the mark—teachers, Inspectors, and scholars—he hoped that each year would show increasingly good results. In conclusion, he would be happy to answer any questions that might be asked of him.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £226,673, to complete the sum for the Science and Art Department.

In reply to Mr. BERESFORD HOPE,

VISCOUNT SANDON said, that it was proposed to remove some of the temporary buildings at South Kensington and to erect buildings which would cost about £80,000, thus enabling them to provide an Art Library and Art Reading Room.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £80,447, to complete the sum for the British Museum (including Furniture, &c).

MR. BERESFORD HOPE said, it had hitherto been customary for one of the Trustees of the Museum to move the Vote, which had always appeared in a separate item on the Estimates, and in the absence of his right hon. Colleague (Mr. Walpole) he wished to call the attention of the Committee to one or two points. There was a long-standing grievance on the part of the officials of the British Museum which had now been under consideration since the year 1836. In that year a Resolution was passed by the Trustees to the effect that the salaries of the officers were miserably inadequate for the remuneration of eminent men, and in 1859 a statement was made that it was necessary to increase the number of attendants, and the number had been increased three-fold. Everything had been increased but the amount of remuneration. In 1873 a sub-committee of finance was appointed by the Trustees, and the result was the recommendation of an immediate increase in the amount of the salaries. The Lords of the Treasury, however, stated that they did not feel justified in acceding to the increase recommended. Since that time an inquiry into the subject, amongst others, had been made by the Civil Service Commissioners, who stated that the salaries of the staff appointed were very small in comparison with the importance of the work performed, and that such a scale of remuneration ought to be fixed as would attract the services of men of eminence. Up to the present time, however, nothing had been done, and he trusted that this year would be the last of the existence of such a scandal.

LORD ELCHO complained that the salaries of the officials in the British Museum had not been increased during the last 40 years, notwithstanding the fact that the work had increased considerably, and that the necessary expenditure of persons engaged in the occupation had been largely enhanced. He hoped that before the Estimate for next year was laid before Parliament, the matter would be carefully considered by the Treasury, in the interest alike of the individuals concerned, of art, and of the British Museum.

MR. SPENCER WALPOLE expressed his regret that he had not been able to arrive in sufficient time to move the Vote. He observed that when the Report was made by the Commissioners of which the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair) was Chairman, the Treasury in the case of the British Museum reserved to itself the power of considering in what way the officers and assistants in that institution should be appointed and paid under the new regulations. It was represented to the Treasury that the Museum officers ought not to be paid in the same way as the clerks in other Departments, seeing that special qualifications of a peculiar character would necessarily be required for such officers and assistants. The Trustees recommended that an inquiry should be instituted by the Treasury officers, and that they should meet some of the officers of the British Museum to consider the question of the salaries to be awarded to the Staff, and if that inquiry were instituted he hoped that it would be completed during the autumn. He did not think there were any special circumstances to which it was necessary for him to call the attention of the Committee, except to state that in consequence of certain complaints of the delay which sometimes took place in the production of books. The Trustees had caused new arrangements to be made which would prevent such delays in future. The average time for the delivery of books did not now exceed 20 minutes.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK said, that after the strong expression of opinion in the House last year he was certainly disappointed that the matter remained in the same unsatisfactory state. Another strong point was the difference between the salaries of those gentlemen and gentlemen in other Departments. The country wanted the very best men that could be had for the British Museum, and the present scale of salaries was certainly very low.

LORD ELCHO expressed a hope that some effectual means would be taken to make the Museum fire-proof.

MR. WHITWELL would be glad if the Secretary to the Treasury could give the Committee some assurance as to the salaries of the officials.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, that any advance which would be made in the salaries of those officials would be of a discriminating character. The Treasury were at perfect accord with the Trustees on the subject. The Treasury desired to do justice to gentlemen than whom there was probably not a more able or better qualified staff in the world for the duties they discharged; but the Treasury were also conscious of the responsibility which rested upon them not to give greater salaries than the just claims of the officers might entitle them to receive. A most careful inquiry would be made into the claims of those gentlemen, the work they undertook, and the duties they performed, and it was proposed to adjust the salaries according to the information thus collected and submitted to the Treasury. The Trustees would appoint a Committee of their own Body to meet one or two gentlemen from the Treasury, and the whole case would be judged according to its merits.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £1,400, to complete the sum for the National Portrait Gallery.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, as one of the Trustees, begged to express their sense of obligation to the Treasury for having granted them so much additional room. That additional room would be ample for the collection for many years to come. The new galleries were very good in many respects, but they were frightfully combustible. They were only shanties, having the faces of whited sepulchres, and though the Trustees would do their best not to burn the collections down, they were looking forward with confidence to the time when they would not be haunted any longer by a perpetual apprehension.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £7,610, to complete the sum for the University of London.

(6.) £288,227, to complete the sum for Public Education in Scotland.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, the Education Estimates for Scotland up to April, 1877, were £438,227, or an excess of £81,817 over the Vote of last year, which was £356,410. That increase was principally caused by the increase of the annual grants to day and evening schools, which represented £44,723. There was also an increase in the building grants of £32,000, but these, he hoped, would soon come to an end, because, as hon. Gentlemen knew, there was a good deal of building to do before the supply was satisfactory. The increase in the average attendance was so far satisfactory, as it was 40,000 over the previous year—an encouraging result of the labours in Scotland in the cause of education. The Department had been happy to get two additional Inspectors and five additional assistant Inspectors. From that addition it was hoped there would be a considerable advantage to the schools. Grants were estimated to be paid for 346,842 children, or 22,000 more than last year, an increase of 6·8 per cent. The rate of grant per child for 1875-6 was 13*s.* 7*d.*; it was estimated for 1876-7 at 14*s.* 6*d.*, which he thought was encouraging, as showing that the Scotch schools were doing their very best to earn the Government grant, and also as telling a story of considerable intellectual advance over the previous year. He was sorry, for the sake of England, to see that the Scotch children, by their exertions, were able to get larger aid from the Treasury than English children. As to the rate of progress, in the three years up to August 31, 1872, the scholars on the register increased 17 per cent, or 38,800; in the three years up to August 31, 1875, they increased 50·8 per cent, or 135,600. The average attendance up to August 31, 1872, had increased 17·3 per cent, or 31,500; up to August, 1875, it had increased 42·2 per cent, or 90,000. In 1872, out of every 100 on the register, 79·9 were in average attendance; in 1875 only 75·3 were. That decreased percentage, of course, was to be accounted for by the extra pressure all over Scotland which had driven into the schools a number of unruly and unwilling children; but that would mend itself as time went on, and he did not think it should make them uneasy.

There was quite sufficient to show that there was a great deal of educational zeal still in Scotland, and he hoped it would not slacken. We were very much indebted to those who took the lead in Scotland; and by improving the standard and by the increased number of Inspectors, every year would, he hoped, bring us nearer to the conclusion of the great work in Scotland as well as in England—namely, getting the children into the schools, having them well taught there, and sending them out into the world better able to fight the battle of life.

Mr. RAMSAY said, he would point out that the provisions of the Elementary Education Bill which was before the House were in some respects more favourable to poor districts in England than were the corresponding provisions which were contained in the Education Code for Scotland, and he would ask the noble Lord whether there was any intention on his part to make the provisions of the Scottish Code equally favourable to the poor districts in Scotland as they were proposed to be made in regard to school districts in England? There could be no question that in many districts of Scotland the poverty was more intense than that to be found in any district of England; and he therefore trusted that the noble Lord might be willing to intimate that he would be prepared in the course of next Session to make the provisions as regarded poor districts as favourable to the people of Scotland as the provisions of the Elementary Education Bill were to the people of England.

Mr. M'LAREN said, that he approved of what his hon. Friend said about the desirability of placing the two countries on terms of perfect equality; but he (Mr. M'Laren) objected to wait for another year. He wanted to have it done this year, and he had therefore given Notice of a clause to be proposed on the Report of the English Education Bill, to the effect that Clause 47 of that Bill should be extended to Scotland so as to allow the children to earn 17*s.* 7*d.*, and small parishes to obtain all the pecuniary benefits which similar parishes in England would enjoy under the Bill. The noble Lord had stated that the children in Scotland earned 13*s.* 7*d.* last year, and that he estimated they would earn 14*s.* 6*d.* during the next year; but he had put down the English children to earn 17*s.* 6*d.*, and he (Mr. M'Laren) must object to the question of equal treatment to Scotland being postponed for another year.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE observed, that he was not in the House when the noble Lord made his statement, and therefore he did not know how far the noble Lord had taken notice of the points referred to by the Board of Education in Scotland. He was happy to be able to bear his testimony, so far as his experience went, to the generally satisfactory working of the school board system; but there were two or three points in which the Act passed for Scotland might with advantage be amended. There were matters connected with the election of the school boards which were capable of improvement. There should be a means of gradual change. He trusted that the Government had the subject under their consideration, and that the Lord Advocate would be prepared to bring in a Bill next Session.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY wished to ask his noble Friend the Vice President whether he could give the Committee any information as to the cost of the late school board elections throughout the whole of Scotland? He believed that the first school board elections cost the country £28,000, and it seemed to him that a great deal of this money was thrown away. He hoped that they might find that the elections had not cost near so much on the last occasion. Perhaps the noble Lord would be able to give them some information on that point. He cordially concurred with what had fallen from the hon. Baronet the Member for Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke). He (Sir Graham Montgomery) thought that the time had come when they might profitably have an amendment of the Scotch Education Act. The English Education Act was being amended in the present Session, and he thought that there were many important points in which the Scotch Education Act might also be amended. He would be glad to know if it was the intention of the Government to deal with that matter next Session?

Viscount SANDON said, that with regard to what the hon. Gentleman the Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay) stated as to putting the two Codes on the same footing, he need hardly assure him that when the matter was settled he would take care that Scotland was placed upon the same footing as England. It was obvious that in the matter of grants the two countries should run in the same groove. Of course, the hon. Member was aware that the proposals of the Government Education Bill would not come into operation until next April, so that there would be ample time to put into the Codes any provisions that were necessary to effect the object that he had in view. The hon. Baronet the Member for Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke) had alluded to the cost of school buildings in the small Scotch places. The Government had endeavoured since they had been in office to diminish, if possible, the cost of school buildings in some of those places by trying to adapt their plans in concert with hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House to the peculiar requirements of these remote districts. He did not know that they could do much more in that direction; but of course any suggestion which the hon. Baronet might make on the subject would receive their attention. As to the teachers, they had shown in the Code that they quite appreciated the difficulty of a supply of teachers for the poor districts, and provided that they were thoroughly good schools, they had made some relaxation in that direction. He might say as to the question which had been raised by his hon. Friend near him (Sir Graham Montgomery), in regard to the cost of school board elections, that he did not know at present what had been the cost of the Scotch elections. He did not think that he had any figures that would show it. He had no doubt that in time they would be able to get these figures, and they would then be at the service of the House.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) £4,207, to complete the sum for the Board of Education for Scotland.

(8.) £13,754, to complete the sum for Universities, &c., Scotland.

(9.) £1,500, to complete the sum for the National Gallery, &c., Scotland.

(10.) £420,949, to complete the sum for Public Education, Ireland.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in rising to move the Vote, said, that the details of the present year's Estimates did not differ much from those of last year. There was an increase in the Estimate of £12,810 for principal and assistant teachers, due mainly to the expansion of the system of assistant teachers, and to increased expenditure in the way of results for teaching. There was also an increase of £8,000 for paid monitors, which he thought would not be grudged by the Committee, these monitors being very useful in schools where the average attendance was just below the number which was necessary to obtain assistant teachers. There was another increase of £1,000 by way of retiring annuities to teachers. On the other hand, there were certain reductions in the Estimates as compared with last year. There was a reduction of £5,000 owing to the relinquishment of school farms. The subject had been carefully considered, and it was found that those school farms had been worked at considerable annual loss to the country, and that education in agriculture could practically be given equally well in other schools at comparatively little cost. It had therefore been decided to relinquish a certain number of these school farms. There was also a decrease of £5,000 in the amount voted for books and school apparatus, owing to the prices charged to parents for these articles having been raised, so as more nearly to cover the cost of their production. Under the head of Teachers' Residences there was a decrease of £4,250 as compared with the Supplementary Estimate of last year (£5,000), representing a moiety of the annuities payable for loans advanced for the erection of teachers' non-vested residences. The Estimate of £5,000 for grants towards the erection of residences for teachers of vested schools had been transferred to the Vote for the Board of Works. Attention had been already called this Session by the hon. Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) to the failure of the Act of last Session to improve the position of teachers in non-contributory Unions. Although their position was not worse, but was upon the whole slightly better than in the previous year, still he could not say that there had been any material improvement in it. It was suggested that the Act of 1875 might be made compulsory, on the basis of a limited national rate; but it was evident that this would meet with so much opposition that even if the Government had thought it right make such a proposal, it could not have become law during the present Session. He had, therefore, undertaken to endeavour, as far as possible, to meet the difficulty without any recourse to legislation. The subject, he was bound to say, had been discussed by those who had spoken as representatives of the teachers, in a spirit which he did not think was likely to conduce to a settlement of the question. A considerable number of Irish Unions declined to avail themselves of the Act of 1875, and in those Unions the teachers were not in receipt of the contingent result fees. The question was, how to place them in the same position as their brethren in the contributory Unions without departing from the principle of the Act of 1875. He saw no mode in which it could be done, except by placing the managers of those schools in the same position as the Guardians of contributory Unions, and accepting voluntary payments by the managers in place of payment from the rates by the Guardians of contributory Unions. If managers of schools did not avail themselves of this proposal it would not be for want of ability to do so, for there were few places in the present circumstances of Ireland in which the managers of schools might not, if they chose, raise so small a sum as was required for this purpose. If these proposals were not accepted, and many Unions, as was very possible, became non-contributory before next spring, it might be necessary for the Government to propose that the National School Teachers Act of 1875 should be made compulsory on the basis of a limited national rate. Had the amount of £60,000 required by the Act of 1875 been universally voted by the Unions the position of the teachers, receiving £180,000 by way of results besides a considerable sum in addition to their salaries, would have been satisfactory, and so far as Parliament was concerned the national teachers of Ireland would have had no fair grounds for application for increased payments from national funds. The subject of pensions had been for some time under consideration; it was surrounded with difficulties, and it must be considered with reference to the position and claims of teachers in England and Scotland. Teachers in Ireland were not Civil Servants; they were appointed by the managers, and they were subject to dismissal by the managers at three months' notice. The teachers were prepared to submit to very small percentage deductions from their incomes in order to provide a superannuation fund, and yet their expectations of pensions were extremely high, including retirement on full pay at 55 and corresponding advantages at younger ages, which went far beyond the system of pensions enjoyed by Civil Servants. These expectations rendered it less possible than ever to make any proposal to Parliament on what must, in any event, be a very difficult subject. If the Act of 1875 were put in force throughout Ireland the teachers, so far as their incomes from Government were concerned, would have been in a satisfactory position; but he was bound to say that they had a fair claim to an increase of income from other resources. It appeared from the accounts of the National Board of Education that the total income of the teaching staff from all sources in the year had been £571,648 18*s.* 11*d.* Of this amount 19·7 per cent was locally provided, and 80·3 per cent was derived from funds placed at the disposal of the Commissioners by the State. These figures showed that if there was any deficiency in the incomes of the teachers, it was not due to Parliament, but to the failure of local contributions as compared with those of England and Scotland. That deficiency was not contemplated in the original theory of Irish Education. The late Lord Derby, in his well-known letter, laid down the principle that the National Board of Education before making grants were invariably to require that local funds should be raised, and that they were to refuse all applications in which a salary for the master was not locally provided. That rule had not been carried into effect, while the proportion of State aid had gradually increased until it now formed the main portion of the income of the Irish teachers. The Royal Commission on Primary Education in Ireland in 1870 recommended that the school fees of all children should either be paid for by themselves or out of local rates. In the rules of the National Board of Education it was laid down that before aid was granted the Commissioners were to be satisfied that some provision was made for the payment of the teacher's salary. So far as theory was concerned, it had always been supposed that the State payments were not to be in lieu of local contributions, but in aid of them. The practice had, however, been in the contrary direction, and there was now no rule which secured the payment of any definite amount from local sources or school fees. That was not a satisfactory condition of things. Looking back at the past state of Ireland, there might formerly have been sufficient reasons for not insisting upon a larger proportion of local aid. Circumstances had, however, greatly changed. The National system had spread throughout Ireland, and, in the opinion of the Government, the time had come when a definite effort should be made to secure that those locally interested should bear a certain share of the cost of Irish education. We could not expect the same amount of voluntary local contributions from Ireland as from England and Scotland, nor did he think it possible to require from the managers of an Irish school the same expenditure as in other parts of the Kingdom. The time had, however, come, for insisting on the payment of proper school fees. In the last Report of the Commissioners of National Education a statement was given of the average annual payment per pupil in the schools in various Irish counties, and the difference was somewhat remarkable. In the county of Cavan the average sum paid per pupil for the year was 2*s.* 6¾*d.*, including subscriptions and local payments, while the sum paid in school fees was only 1*s.* 7½*d.* Was that a fair payment by pupils? Again, in Longford, 1*s.* 3¼*d.* was the average amount in school fees, and 10¾*d.* the average local contribution. And in Leitrim the amount of fees per scholar was 1*s.* 1*d.*, and the local subscription 10¾*d.* An effort should be made to change this system, and the Government proposed to make an early communication to the Commissioners with regard to the payment of school fees by pupils in 1877. An increase of school fees would add to the income of teachers, but it would, he hoped, exercise a still better effect upon parents and the pupils themselves. There was at present a great discrepancy between the number of children on the rolls and the average attendance, and there was reason to believe that this was due to an opinion on the part of the parents that the education for which they paid nothing could not be worth very much. And although an increase in the school fees might cause at first a considerable decrease in the number on the rolls, yet it was probable it would produce very little effect upon the average attendance, and might even increase it. It should be required of the manager of every school to find a certain proportion of the cost of the school from local sources, and that proportion should be not less a sum than would be produced by an annual payment of 1*d.* per week for each child. There were many cases of parents, principally in Ulster, who willingly paid a higher fee, but he thought 1*d.* ought to be the minimum; and if the manager declined to require that fee, then he should find the necessary contribution from some other source. He did not say that there could be no exception made to this rule. There were outlying districts so poor that they could not expect even this fee to be paid, as might be the case in the Western Islands; but the exception should in no case be made without local inquiry and the issuing of a special Minute by the National Education Board, showing the grounds upon which it was made; for it ought to be very rare. With respect to the payment of contingent result fees, his proposition, briefly stated, was this. The Government were willing so far to modify the operation of the National School Teachers Act of last year in favour of the teachers, as to allow for this year the payment of those fees to the teachers of schools in non-contributory Unions where a sum was provided from any source by the managers of the school, amounting to not less than would be produced by a fee of 1*d.* per week per child, and equal to that which would have been voted by the Guardians for the benefit of such school if they had agreed to become contributory under the National School Teachers Act—in a word, they would accept a local contribution *bonâ fide* provided from any source in lieu of that from the rates. He might be told that the effect of the enforced payment of a minimum fee of 1*d.* per week would be to close a great many schools. He did not think such would be the case. For his part, he believed that it would do as much to improve the condition of education in Ireland and the feeling of the people as to their responsibility towards their children as anything which had been attempted for the advancement of Irish education since the foundation of the system. The change ought doubtless to be worked with care and prudence and with the desire to avoid inflicting hardships; and if it were he had no doubt that it would be of the utmost benefit to all concerned—parents, children, and teachers. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the Vote.

Mr. MELDON said, the course pursued by the Government had materially injured the teachers ever since 1874, and had also injuriously affected education. Many of the teachers were very much worse off than they were before the Government interfered. Attention had been called to these facts in the month of March last, and now they were at the end of the Session treated to a general disquisition instead of a practical plan for redressing what was a real grievance. As to a national rate for national purposes, the teachers had not expressed any opinion as to the source whence the funds should be drawn; but they did claim that as the Government had put them in a worse position than they were two years ago, they had a right to look to the Government for compensation. He hoped the Chief Secretary would explain his plan rather more fully as to the contributions.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he proposed that the Government should accept contributions from the managers, or any one locally interested in a school.

Mr. MELDON observed, that he understood that if the managers subscribed one-third the Government would then subscribe two-thirds. That might at first sight be a fair arrangement; but the case of Ireland was very different from that of England, because the Roman Catholics had been in many cases compelled to erect training schools for themselves, and a large proportion of the schools were entirely supported by voluntary contributions, without any aid whatever from the Government, yet at the same time the teachers were not liable to be dismissed by the managers, but were in fact the servants of the National Board of Education. On the subject of pensions to teachers, he could not help thinking that scant justice had been done. Some little time back a deputation of Irish national school teachers waited upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer to ask his favourable consideration of the whole subject of pensions to be granted to members of their body; but the Government had chosen to regard the representations made to them as a demand for more than could possibly be given, and had, therefore, declined to make any proposal on the subject. As to the question of residences, he gave the right hon. Gentleman credit for having redeemed his pledge, but he wished to see a further alteration of the rules with the view of conferring greater benefit on the teachers. He urged that no grants should be made to schools unless proper residences were provided, residences being, in his point of view, as important as school buildings. Another point in connection with the system of education was, he was informed, the abolition of the Roman Catholic Secretary to the Board of Education. That was a distinct breach of faith. The Roman Catholic Secretary of the Board was appointed because Roman Catholic managers could communicate more freely with that officer than with the Protestant Secretary, whose salary was now to be increased in consequence of the abolition of the other office. He wished also to observe that last year the Reports of Inspectors of National Education had been omitted from the Blue Book furnished to Members. In previous years the Reports were given, and as these afforded the only means by which hon. Gentlemen could judge of the efficiency of the teaching staffs, he hoped that next year these Reports would be printed, as they had been heretofore.

The O'CONOR DON gave his most hearty approval to the scheme of the right hon. Baronet to accept local contributions from any source in lieu of rates. There was no better way to improve education in Ireland than to exact certain payments from the parents, as thus they would be taught to value education more. If not only the school fees, but the amount of the Government grant, depended on the attendance of the children, the teachers would be induced to exert themselves, and before long we should find not only that there would be greater regularity of attendance, but that the number of children in attendance would be increased. On the whole, the statement of the right hon. Baronet was one which should commend itself to the approval of Irish Members, and his only regret was that it had been made so late in the Session, because he believed, if made earlier, it would have given general satisfaction. He hoped there was no intention to abolish the Commissioners' second secretaryship in Dublin. He did not think it would be justifiable to keep up a larger number of officers than there was work for them to do, and he would not justify the retention of the two secretaries merely on the ground of religion; but the work of the Department was increasing every year, and the number of schools was being largely added to, and he believed two secretaries were required.

Mr. ERRINGTON felt grateful to the Chief Secretary for the statement he had made, and for the proposals he had placed before the Committee. Very much depended on raising the salaries and positions of the masters, and the improvement would depend on the manner in which these changes were to be made. The principles that ought to be followed were those raised by the right hon. Baronet—namely, payment by results fees and local contributions. He hoped, as was proposed in the Bill of last year, that the workhouse teachers would be allowed to share in the benefits of the results fees system.

Lord CHARLES BERESFORD was sorry the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) was not in his place, because the Motion in his name would have raised the question whether the Board system or the denominational system was best. The right hon. Baronet, he thought, was rather feeling for denominational education, because if schools were supported by local contributions it would lead to a denominational system eventually. He himself was decidedly for denominational education. He had been lately in Ceylon, where Roman Catholics, Protestants, Buddhists, and Mahomedans had each schools of their own, and he went over them with the Governor, Sir William Gregory, who expressed great satisfaction with the working of the system. He did not believe in the religious difficulty. He had no doubt that the Buddhist, the Mahomedan, the Protestant, and the Roman Catholic would all in the end go to the same "happy hunting-ground" if they did what they believed to be right.

Dr. WARD expressed his opinion that the national system in Ireland had been an entire failure.

Mr. M. BROOKS suggested that if compulsory payment was enforced it should be fixed at as low a rate as possible, because of the general poverty of the parents, many of whom could not afford to pay 1*d*. a-week.

Captain NOLAN thought the plans proposed would press rather hardly; would scarcely remove the evils complained of, and would raise the salaries very little. He accepted the principle of a national rate for the support of education in Ireland. Indeed, that was one of the first things that he would vote for had the Irish the control of their own affairs; but he insisted upon this, that a majority of the Irish Members should settle what the national system of education should be. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would state whether he regarded the provision of residences as local contributions.

Mr. GIBSON hoped the Government would direct their attention to the system of local inspection before the commencement of the next Session. The duties of the Inspectors were most arduous and important. They were men of great ability, but were labouring under great disadvantages as compared with the Inspectors in England, whose salaries exceeded theirs by hundreds a-year. He thought as the duties of the Inspectors in both countries greatly resembled each other, there ought to be something like similarity in their position.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY entirely concurred in the remarks of the hon. Gentleman, and said he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take the matter into consideration.

The O'DONOGHUE said, that in his opinion a compulsory national rate, provided it were moderate in amount and not liable to vary, would not be unpopular with Boards of Guardians in Ireland. The cause of its unpopularity was that it was uneven in its pressure, and that there seemed to be no possibility of fixing a limit to it.

Mr. M'CARTHY agreed with the hon. Member for Dublin (Mr. Brooks) that some provision should be made for remitting some portion of the fees required from parents with large families.

Mr. SWANSTON thought the Chief Secretary had gone the right way to work to stimulate national education in Ireland, because parents took a greater interest in the education of their children when they had to contribute something towards it.

Mr. MELDON complained of the disparity between the numbers of Catholic and Protestant Inspectors, and urged that teachers should be relieved from the enforcement of the payment of fees—a duty which made them unpopular, and which ought to be undertaken by the managers. He also desired to know whether it was the intention to abolish one of the secretaryships, and to appoint an assistant secretary, who would discharge the duties at a much lower salary?

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY contended that as the Roman Catholics were in a majority in Ireland they should, of course, have the majority of the official appointments, but beyond that they ought not to go, for it would be undoing all the heroic measures of the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), by which he thought that the question of a man's religion in these matters had been settled once and for ever.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said, the proposal of the hon. Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) that the system of lending money for the building of teachers' residences to the managers of non-vested schools should be applied also to vested schools had been suggested to him a short time ago by the teachers. He thought it a matter well deserving of consideration, and hoped that next Session he might be able to propose the necessary change in the law. The manager, and not the teacher, would be responsible for the collection of the school fees, and precautions would be taken that the teacher should receive from the manager the proper amount of fees, according to the number of pupils. The reason the Reports of the Inspectors had not been included this year in the annual Report of the Commissioners was that it had been decided, mainly on considerations of expense, to publish the Inspectors' Reports trienially instead of annually. The arrangement proposed by the Treasury respecting the Secretaryships to the Board was simply that the senior Secretary should retire and the junior Secretary become senior Secretary; that another officer should be appointed as Junior Secretary and Accountant, and the office of accountant be abolished. The position of the Inspectors of Irish national schools had been materially improved within the last two years, and any fair claim they might have in the future for any increase of salary would at the proper time receive due consideration. He thanked the Committee for the reception which they had given the proposal as to the enforcement of school fees.

Captain NOLAN objected to the principle of making school managers responsible for the collection of school pence. The effect would be that clergymen who had two or three schools under their control would every year be let in for about £30 worth of bad debts, in addition to the cost of collection.

Mr. MELDON complained that a sum of £2,500 a-year had been spent in Post Office orders for the payment of the salaries of the teachers.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, the reason for this charge was that the system pursued in Ireland was different from that in England. In Ireland the Commissioners paid the salaries direct; but in England and Scotland the payments were made by grants to the managers of the schools, and were not given as salaries, but simply as the contribution of the State towards the total cost of the schools. He should cause inquiry to be made as to whether any other system than that of Post Office orders could be adopted by which the payment of the salaries with equal regularity would be secured.

Vote *agreed to.*

(11.) £430, to complete the sum for the Commissioners of Education (Endowed Schools), Ireland.

(12.) £1,739, to complete the sum for the National Gallery, Ireland.

(13.) £1,731, to complete the sum for the Royal Irish Academy.

(14.) £3,587, to complete the sum for the Queen's University, Ireland.

(15.) £8,822, to complete the sum for the Queen's Colleges, Ireland.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

POLLUTION OF RIVERS BILL.

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt.*)

[BILL 186.] CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR: I have placed an Amendment against proceeding with this Bill, because it has such important bearings to the public, that it ought to be brought on at reasonable hours, when the public can learn what we are doing in regard to it. That hitherto has not been the case. It was brought on for a second reading at 1 o'clock one morning and then was not discussed, for all the speaking was, as to whether we should then proceed with it. But on the assurances that ample opportunity would be given for its discussion on going into Committee we allowed the second reading to be taken. Nevertheless, the Committee came upon us by surprise on Saturday morning, again at 1 o'clock, when several of those most interested in the Bill were absent. So far as the public were concerned, the only information which they received, through the newspapers, was that the Bill had passed two stages. The Bill originally was not a strong one. Two Commissions and a Select Committee of the Lords had inquired into the Pollution of Rivers, and had given full recommendations as to the course of legislation. Very few of these are embodied in this Bill. Still the Bill, as introduced, tried to deal in a simple way with certain kinds of pollution. It prohibited solid refuse from being thrown into rivers; it dealt with sewage pollutions: and, in a vague sort of way, it treated of pollutions caused by manufactories and mines. It was very tender to past sinners, but future sinners it did not tolerate. Pollution generally was not considered an offence, if the old polluters had used the best practicable and available means to render their polluting liquids harmless. Prosecutions were not to be undertaken, except with the consent of the Local Government Board, and every possible precaution was taken to protect the interests of manufacturers, while the interests of the public were very subordinate even in the eyes of the framers of the first Bill. But now the Bill is so altered that public interests seemed to have vanished altogether in the background, and the interests of the manufacturers are pushed into prominence in every clause of the Bill. Manufacturers are now ardent supporters of the Bill, and well they may be. In Scotland, at least, it interprets the law entirely in their favour. Our common law was intolerant of pollution, and thought the interests of the public were of more importance than the interests of polluters. But this Bill, in the whole of its spirit, tells the Scotch Judges that they have been mistaken in their view of the law, and that they must always consider the interests of polluters, if engaged in mines or manufactures, as of more importance than the interests of the public. Take, for example, the 8th clause, which forbids even the Local Government Board to give consent to proceedings under the Act, if it will inflict injury on the interests of any manufacturing industry. In the first edition that prohibition was not there at all, then in the second edition the Bill threw its mantle of protection over the textile industries, and now by the third edition the Local Government Board is to protect all industries whatever against the public rights to have rivers free from pollution. No wonder that manufacturers highly approve this Bill of the President of the Local Government Board, and urge that it should be passed with a singular unanimity. Every operative clause in the Bill has thus had its force taken out of it as a means of protecting manufacturing interests against the assaults of public prosecution. But a Bill against pollution was not required at all in the interests of manufacturers, though it was much desired in the interests of the public. And for these interests, at least so far as Scotland is concerned, the Bill had far better not have been brought in. It does, in England, better the law as regards solid refuse and sewage, but for polluting liquids of mines and manufactories it is worth very little. I object also to the Bill because it immensely increases central as against local authority. The powers of the Local Government Inspectors are marvellous. There is no security given in the Bill that the Inspector need be a qualified man, and yet he is to be the sole judge whether a town, village, or manufactory may pollute rivers, for he may give a certificate that they may continue to pollute streams for five years more. He may declare that an old manufactory has no practicable means for preventing pollution, and yet a new manufactory must do what it is said to be impossible, according to the Inspector's judgment, for the old manufactory to perform. The Bill, as a whole, is so little in the interests of the public and so vastly in the interests of polluters, that I see little advantage in passing it. And it so greatly increases central power that I think it is a dangerous encroachment on our principles of local government. But I know how useless it is to divide the House against a Bill at this stage of its progress, and at this period of the Session; and having thus delivered my protest against it, and my refusal to accept it as any efficient measure for preventing the pollution of rivers, I do not intend to trouble the House by taking a division on the Amendment which I have placed on the Paper.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the right hon. Gentleman was quite wrong in supposing that anything that fell from him did not deserve, and would not receive the attention of the House. At the same time, the right hon. Member would be saving time if he had gone into Committee and moved his Amendments. The difficulties of the question were immense, and the enormous capital at stake was not to be lightly dealt with. It was true that the Scotch Members supported the Bill; but it was only just to them to say that their support was given before any of the alterations said to be so particularly favourable to manufacturers as against the public had been made in its clauses. He hoped that in the future a good deal of the centralization complained of would be removed. He agreed that it was desirable that the administration of the Bill should be placed in the hands of the local authorities; but if it was proposed to do so at first there would be a great outcry against it. As to the third part of the Bill which the right hon. Gentleman complained of, all he could say was that the clause to which he referred was but an amplification of language which already stood in the Bill. He denied that the Amendments introduced through his agency would have the effect of destroying the original intention of the Bill.

Colonel MURE remarked, that although no Bill had ever been so much condemned, there had not been a single Amendment placed on the Paper except by manufacturers. If the interests of the public were so much concerned, surely some one would have announced an Amendment. In the interests of the public as well as the proprietors he was anxious to see the question settled. It was because other Scotch Members were in their places, and the right hon. Member for Edinburgh University was not, that he had not an opportunity of discussing the Bill on the occasion in question.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE thought some explanation ought to have been given of the introduction the other day in the House of Lords of a Suspensory Bill which would have the effect of preventing any pollutions for the ensuing year. He thought a case had been made out for not passing the Bill this Session. He moved that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Mr. M'LAREN trusted the House would proceed with the Bill, as nine-tenths of the public, in addition to the manufacturers, were in favour of the measure.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT expressed a hope that the hon. Member for Chelsea would not press his Motion. His right hon. Friend (Mr. Lyon Playfair) did not persevere with his Amendment, not liking to take the responsibility of doing so. What the House ought to consider was whether the Bill was not better than nothing. He recognized the force of what the President of the Local Government Board said the other night—that it was a great thing to get the framework of the Bill.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered.*

Clause (Application of this Act to Ireland,)—(*Mr. Gibson,*)—*added.*

Amendments made.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 13, to leave out the words "at a reasonable cost."—(*Mr. Lyon Playfair.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Debate arising.

And it being ten minutes before Seven of the clock, the Debate was adjourned till *this day.*

The House suspended its sitting at five minutes to Seven of the clock.

The House resumed its sitting at Nine of the clock.

IRISH POLITICAL PRISONERS.

RESOLUTION.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER rose to call the attention of the House to the subject of the Irish political prisoners; and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the time has come when Her Majesty's gracious pardon may be advantageously extended to the prisoners, whether convicted before the civil tribunals or by courts martial, who are and have been for many years undergoing punishment for offences arising out of insurrectionary movements connected with Ireland."

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present—

MR. O'CONNOR POWER continued: The subject of the Resolution had engaged the attention of many Members of the House since the opening of the Session, and he was only endeavouring to fulfil an expectation which was general in submitting for the consideration of the House the Motion which he had read. The terms of the Motion were substantially the same as those forming the declaration in favour of amnesty to the Irish political prisoners, which had received the signatures of 136 Members of the House, excluding the names of the hon. and learned Member for Barnstaple (Mr. Waddy), and the hon. Member for Blackburn (Mr. Briggs), who claimed to have signed the declaration under a misconception. With respect to the different classes of the prisoners whose liberation he advocated, he had from the first contended that all those mentioned in the Return furnished by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Home Department should be regarded as political prisoners. Of the 18 prisoners whose names were in the Home Secretary's Return three had been liberated by the expiration of their terms of imprisonment; and while during the existence of the present Ministry not one political prisoner had been released by the clemency of the Crown, no less than six had been rescued from the penal settlement of Western Australia in defiance of the Crown. There were, however, nine prisoners still in custody. He reminded the House of this affair of the rescue, because to his mind it afforded conclusive proof that the penal settlement in question was not the pleasant abode which the Prime Minister had represented it to be. If it was, he could not imagine why those six men should have risked their lives to escape from it. He had given the number of political prisoners as nine, but there were three others whose cases might come under the same category, the offences of which they were convicted having undoubtedly arisen out of the insurrectionary movement in Ireland. The attention of the Government had been repeatedly drawn to the case of Michael Davitt; but it had been urged against his release that there must have been some aggravating circumstances in his case, because the Judge sentenced him to 15 years' penal servitude while awarding only seven years to Wilson, who was tried for the same offence at the same time. He did not find in the report of the trial any circumstances but those which ought to create for Davitt the greatest possible sympathy. The testimony of a perjured informer named Corydon was accepted against him, but an English jury could hardly have been acquainted with the character of that infamous witness, or they would have hesitated before convicting any one on his evidence. The convictions of the political prisoners generally were obtained by similar evidence and by a system of disgraceful jury packing, which, he rejoiced to say, Lord O'Hagan's Act would render impossible, or at least very difficult, in future. It would scarcely be credited that a police officer was sent down from

Dublin Castle to Clonmel for the purpose of entrapping the young men of the locality, and inducing them to join the conspiracy; but it was, nevertheless, the fact, which was brought to light in the progress of the trials. The *modus operandi* of this official was almost too disgusting for recital. His name was Talbot. He was a member of the Protestant Church, but while engaged in the nominal duties of a water bailiff in Clonmel no one was more conspicuous in attendance at Mass on the Sunday morning. He simulated Catholicism to the extent of partaking of the Communion at the altar, thus crowning his hypocrisy by an act of unblushing sacrilege. Having thus wormed himself into the confidence of the peasantry, he succeeded in persuading them to join the conspiracy. Then he denounced them to the Government, and finally turned up against them to swear away their liberties or their lives. It was with the aid of creatures like this sacrilegious and perjured wretch, Talbot, that Irish patriots were made felons and innocent victims of tyranny and misgovernment. With reference to Davitt, it was right to remind the House again that the Judge before whom he was tried bore testimony to the uprightness of character which he exhibited during the progress of the trial. Davitt offered to bear, in addition to his own sentence, the punishment which was to be awarded to an associate of his, whom he declared to be perfectly innocent; but he (Mr. O'Connor Power) trusted that when the question of the release of those prisoners came again for consideration before the Cabinet, Davitt's action in that respect would not be regarded as an aggravating circumstance, which should justify his further imprisonment. Besides Davitt, there were still in prison two of the men who were convicted of having been concerned in the rescue of Colonel Kelly and Captain Deasy, or the shooting of Serjeant Brett, at Manchester, and six soldiers convicted of various breaches of the Articles of War were still in custody. Now, with respect to these Manchester men, he denied that they were guilty of murder. They did not take life. They did not atttempt to take life. They did not even contemplate the taking of life. The truth was that at a time of panic a technical point of law was strained against them, and a terrified Manchester jury sacrificed them to political prejudice and national excitement. He asked for the release of those prisoners, because the law had been more than sufficiently vindicated—three Irishmen had perished on the scaffold, one more Irishman had died in prison, and six other Irishmen had undergone five years of penal servitude each. He submitted that further punishment would not increase respect for the law, but rather produce the belief that there was a vindictive spirit in its administration. With reference to the soldiers, some of whom had been in prison for the last 10 years, he went at some length into their cases last year. He showed how they were but a portion of the rank and file of the Confederacy—detained, although their leaders were some years ago set at liberty. They believed that the obligations of patriotism were more binding than the obligations of a military oath, and they did what some of the great historical characters whom England delighted to honour had done before under similar circumstances—they disregarded their oaths, and entered what they believed to be the service of their country, determined to sacrifice their lives, if necessary, in her emancipation. They might denounce their conduct as illegal and revolutionary, but there was nothing sordid or mean about it. It was conduct such as they were accustomed to applaud in foreign countries, and which they regarded as courageous, magnanimous, and disinterested everywhere but in Ireland. A Commission had recommended a separation between political and other prisoners in regard to their treatment; but that recommendation had not been adopted by the Government. The hon. Member then read the letters which had passed between himself and the Home Secretary on the subject of his request for permission to visit the Fenian prisoners in our convict prisons. From this correspondence it appeared that on the 22nd of May last the hon. Gentleman applied for an order to visit the prisoners, and on the 26th received a reply refusing him the order because a full inquiry had been made in 1871 by a Government Commission into the treatment of the prisoners, and also because no good reason was shown why their treatment should now be investigated by a Member of the House of Commons. On the 1st of June he renewed his request to the Home Secretary, stating the grounds on which the Report of the Commission in question had, in his opinion, failed to give satisfaction to the public and to those most interested in the matter; and on the 10th he received another refusal, accompanied by the remark that if the prisoners themselves desired to see him they might do so at the regular times. In the last letter he received from the right hon. Gentleman, if it was meant to be a reply to his own letter, that letter, he should think, had never been seen by him, since it contained no sort of answer to his request for a private interview with the prisoners. He asked that of the right hon. Gentleman, because if anyone wished to know anything of the treatment to which a prisoner was subject, he might as well hold a conversation with the man in the moon for anything he could learn from a prisoner at an ordinary interview in a prison. The rules of the prisons forbad any conversation in relation to his treatment in prison. He argued that the conduct of England towards her political prisoners was without parallel in any civilized nation. He asked on what ground of justice or even State policy the Irish political prisoners were treated like the most desperate felons? In America the proclaimed amnesty had produced a universal feeling of loyalty towards the great Republic; and in France Marshal M'Mahon had pardoned 200 Communists, while those who were detained in prison were not treated as ordinary prisoners. If the "integrity of the Empire" required that those prisoners should remain for some time longer in prison—which he did not at all admit—surely some relaxation might be made of the punishment inflicted upon them. If they were victims of English policy, English policy did not require that they should be tortured to death. They were honest, disinterested, and brave men, and every hour of their incarceration now, after all they had suffered, must bring disgrace and discredit on the English name. He had been so often indebted to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government for the indulgence with which he had treated him that he should say no more, but conclude.

Mr. KENELM DIGBY, in seconding the Resolution, hoped that the House would assent to the liberation of these nine political prisoners. He wished especially to refer to the case of one of them — James Condon — who was an American citizen, whose father was dying of a broken heart, and in whose favour Petitions had been sent to our Government from the Senate and Congress of the United States of America, from Chief Justice Chase, from General Sherman, and from the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cincinnati, all praying that Her Majesty's gracious clemency might be extended towards him. Chief Justice Chase did not question the decision of the jury in his case, but thought that the time had come when, the majesty of the law having been fully vindicated, the prisoner might be released. He might remark that it had been proved in evidence that the prisoner had had no deadly weapon in his hand; yet, having been originally condemned to death, his sentence had been commuted to penal servitude for life. The other prisoners who had been arrested as bystanders had got off with much less severe punishments, it being the misfortune of this man that he had been among the first batch tried, and, therefore, had come in for the heavier share of punishment. He believed that in seconding this Resolution he was only echoing the wish of the people of Ireland, who wished to appeal to the clemency of Her Majesty and of the House. Seeing what these men had undergone, he did not think that any man could wish to make political capital out of their case. Doubtless there were a few, a very few, persons who endeavoured to make a trade of the agitation; but that was not the feeling of the Irish people generally. Wherever there was a public meeting in Ireland bands and processions in favour of an amnesty to the political prisoners were met with. All Irish Members who sat in that House firmly believed that there was no possibility of a recurrence of such a foolish and senseless outbreak as that in which these men had taken part; and they hoped and prayed that by this wise act of clemency one of the last causes of disaffection in Ireland would be removed, and they were sure that the thanks of the whole Irish nation would be received in return for it.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, the time has come when Her Majesty's gracious pardon may be advantageously extended to the prisoners, whether convicted before the civil tribunals or by courts martial, who are and have been for many years undergoing punishment for offences arising out of insurrectionary movements connected with Ireland."—(*Mr. O' Connor Power.*)

General SHUTE was somewhat sorry to be led into this debate, because it was never pleasant to oppose those who were the advocates of mercy. He regretted that the civilians who had been punished for the part they had taken in the Fenian outbreak had ever been designated as political prisoners, of which title they were proud. His own opinion was that they had been misled, and he thought it hard on the taxpayers of the country that they should have to feed and clothe and house, as convicts, a number of miserable, despicable men, who ought to be treated in a more economical manner. If they had been simply whipped like children, and at the cart's tail, in the market-places of their respective towns, they would never have been heard of again. With regard to the military offenders, they could not be regarded as political prisoners. They were perjured traitors to their Crown and country; they had disgraced the Army to which they had belonged, and if any Government were weak enough to release them, it would be most prejudicial to military discipline. Soldiers could never be regarded as "political prisoners." It was the pride of the British Army that, as an Army, they had no politics, and were ready to support the Government of the day, whether led by the present Prime Minister, or even by the hon. and learned Gentleman who commanded the left flank of Opposition (Mr. Butt). He had acted as President of the General Court Martial which tried some of these Fenian prisoners; but his hon. Friends opposite must not suppose that he was in any way prejudiced. On the contrary, he had a letter in his possession from the legal adviser of the prisoners, and who defended them on their trials, complimenting him upon the manner in which the Court was conducted. As a Cavalry officer he had commanded two Irish regiments, and felt sure that the Queen had no more loyal soldiers, and had reason to be proud of her Irish soldiers. He had no prejudices, national or religious, and though he hoped he was a good member of the Church of England himself, he agreed entirely with the spirit of the lines, though he did not know who wrote them—

"For forms of faith let angry bigots fight,
He can't be wrong whose life is in the right!"

He opposed the release of these prisoners from no unkindly feeling, but because he believed that to pardon these men would be to subvert military discipline and make our Army a less safe one than it had hitherto been.

Mr. J. COWEN said, he had not intended to take any part in the discussion, but the extraordinary and heartless speech they had just heard from the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (General Shute) demanded some reply from an English Member. It was not sufficient that the only protest against his almost brutal expressions should come from Irish Representatives. He supported the Resolution of his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo, not so much out of consideration for the prisoners whose cause he so ably pleaded, as out of regard to what he considered to be the honour and interests of England. While he sympathized sincerely with these unfortunate men in their prolonged imprisonment, it was only right for them to recollect, as the hon. and gallant Member for Brighton had so pointedly reminded them, that the men whose case they were considering were members of the Fenian society; that the aim of that organization was to promote the dismemberment of the United Kingdom; and that they sought to achieve their object by force of arms. When these men committed themselves to that enterprize they knew—or at least they ought to have known—that they imperilled their property, their liberty, and their lives. If they had been successful, they would have been hailed by their adherents as heroes. If they had failed, they would have been treated by their enemies as outlaws. A hundred years ago George Washington led an insurrection against British rule, and was successful. Shortly after Robert Emmett attempted to do for Ireland what Washington had done for the United States, but he failed. Emmett was as able a man as Washington, and, in all the moral qualities that went to make up a noble native, the Irish leader was the equal, if not the superior, of the American. Yet the world for the last century had described Washington as a patriot, and "sung his praise in song and story." It had described Emmett as a traitor. The English Government strangled him, and his remains still lay in an "unnamed and unhonoured grave." In the popular regard shown to these two men, they saw the way in which the world treated successful and unsuccessful treason. The Fenians must have known the terrible risks they ran when they lent themselves to the daring project of making Ireland an independent State. Any argument, therefore, founded merely upon personal consideration for the men, he could easily conceive the Government would treat with indifference. But strong and, to his mind, irresistible reasons, could be found, arising out of British considerations alone, why these poor men should be released. It was a settled principle with all modern and civilized Governments that when the excitement occasioned by insurrectionary movements had subsided, generous consideration should be extended to the parties who had engaged in them. All European Governments had acknowledged that such a course of action was judicious. The late Administration admitted the soundness of that policy when they released in two batches, some years ago, the bulk of the Fenian prisoners. But the manner in which they made this partial amnesty was somewhat extraordinary. They freed the captains and the officers of the Fenian Association, and they retained the private soldiers. He considered this course not only unwise but unfair. He did not know that such was the case, but it was easy to conceive that some of the men who were now in prison were victims, and some dupes. Under any circumstances, if there were to be degrees of punishment, the men who had fomented, fostered, and directed the insurrection, were clearly greater offenders than those who had been simply followers. He knew that the ground on which this strange apportionment of guilt was fixed was that the men who were released were civilians, and those who were retained soldiers. It was alleged that soldiers were under exceptional bonds to be loyal to the nation and the Crown—it was said that military men took a special oath, and that the breach of that oath ought to entail upon them special punishment. He denied entirely that an ordinary citizen was under less obligation to be loyal and orderly than a soldier. But admitting, for argument's sake, that the position of the Government in this matter was correct, he begged to call their attention to the fact that if these military men were exceptionally guilty, they had been exceptionally punished. The most of the Fenian prisoners were arrested in 1865-6-7. In 1869, and again in 1870, the civilian prisoners were released. The soldiers had thus really been double the length of time in penal servitude. If the contention of the Government was that these men, in consequence of their connection with the Army, should have a special and severe punishment, that end had been attained by their being confined twice as long as their brother insurgents. But, he repeated, he did not admit that soldiers were under any special bond as to their loyalty; and he challenged the Government, or any hon. Gentleman on the opposite side, to show that in any instance in this country soldiers were treated differently by the Government when found guilty of being connected with political risings. No one would contend that a soldier was under a stronger oath than a Member of Parliament, and yet Mr. Smith O'Brien came to that Table, took the oath as a Member of the House of Commons, went back to Ireland, and attempted to do identically the same thing as the Fenians had done. He was arrested, tried, found guilty, and transported; yet he was not treated more severely than his brother exiles, the late Mr. Martin, Mr. Mitchel, Mr. M'Manus, and others, who were not members of that Assembly. Last year his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo had referred to the case of the Duke of Marlborough, who one week was in the pay and service of King James, and the next was in the camp and under the orders of the Prince of Orange. He would not, however, cite individual instances, but he appealed to hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House if it was not a fact that from the battle of Edgehill to the battle of Culloden there were not scores, but hundreds of men, who at different times took the oath of allegiance to the Stuarts, to the Puritans, to the partizans of the Rebellion of 1688, and to the Hanoverians; and that those oaths when broken did not bring upon those who had taken them any special punishment in consequence of the persons being connected with the Army. Indeed, the very opposite was the practice, and soldiers were treated with more consideration than civilians. Then they had the case of the present President of the French Republic. That antique specimen of Royalist chivalry, the Count de Chambord, had declared that Marshal MacMahon was a modern Bayard, "without fear and without reproach." Yet it was notorious that this same soldier had taken the oath of allegiance to every known dynasty in France, and broken them all in turn. He had been Legitimist, Orleanist, Bonapartist, and Republican in succession, and yet he was recognized, and justly, as one of the most trusted Rulers in Europe. But he would not enumerate personal instances, nor would he go back 100 years to find illustrations. He would quote a case that came down to the present day, to the present Parliament, and to the present Government. He asked the special attention of the Home Secretary to the facts he was going to recite. In 1831 an insurrection took place in Poland. The Polish patriots attempted to do for their country what the Fenians attempted to do for Ireland. The Poles strove to throw off the Russian yoke, as the Fenians strove to disconnect their country with England. A secret political society was formed in Warsaw. Out of that society the insurrection took place. For a time success attended the efforts of the insurgents, but in the end they were compelled to submit to the crushing power of numbers, and—

> "Sarmatia fell, unwept, without a crime."

After the suppression of the rebellion many of the Poles sought and obtained refuge in France, in Switzerland, and in this country. The French Government voted for their relief £100,000; the Swiss Republic gave them help proportionate to their means; and the English House of Commons, to its credit, on the Motion of the late Lord Dudley Stuart and the present Earl of Harrowby, voted sums of money for the maintenance of the destitute Polish exiles. In the course of three or four years the sum of £87,000 was voted by this country for these men. At first the money was given temporarily. Ultimately it was settled as permanent pensions on the refugees. During the last 42 years England, to its honour, had paid no less than £300,000 in aid of the Polish exiles. This year £1,100 was voted for the purpose. What he wished to point out to them was this—Polish refugees, for the most part, were men who had been in the service of Russia, and many of them—the leaders especially—had been Russian soldiers. They had taken the oath of allegiance to the Emperor of Russia in the same way as the Fenian soldiers had taken the oath of allegiance to Queen Victoria. They had broken their oath to the Czar, and had led an insurrection against his authority. He asked how the Government could with any consistency patronize and pension rebellious Russian soldiers, and at the same time punish with such merciless severity a handful of Irish soldiers who had done identically the same thing as their brother-rebels from Poland? If the Home Secretary could explain the difference of treatment, it was more than he could do. There were two reasons alleged for still detaining these unhappy men in captivity. It was said by some that they were kept in slavery in consequence of the fear that their release would produce a renewal of riotous proceedings in Ireland. This was the reason alleged by the late Prime Minister for not granting a complete amnesty in 1869. He (Mr. Cowen) did not think, however, it could have any force now, as, according to the repeated declarations of the Government, Ireland was at this moment in a state of exceptional peace and prosperity. Surely the British Empire that had recently made such a powerful display of naval force in Besika Bay, could not be frightened by a dozen obscure and unknown Irish soldiers. He dismissed this reason for their detention, therefore, as unworthy of consideration. He knew there was a general—he had almost said universal—belief amongst persons in this country, who sympathized with the amnesty movement, that these men were detained in penal servitude by a power—a Ducal and a military power—that was supposed to exist behind the Government. He did not credit the statement, and he made it simply for the purpose of expressing his disbelief in it. There had been times in the history of this country when Princes, Royal Dukes, and Court favourites had been able to send men into exile, to prison, and to the scaffold, to gratify rsonal dislike or private animosity. at period, however, was past, and he lieved that the only persons who were sponsible for the retention of these n were Her Majesty's constitutional lvisers—the Government. He had read thin these last few days, in a respectle and influential American newspaper, at some of the Ministers had feelings of rsonal dislike towards Irish politicians, d that their harsh action in this matter as attributed to these vindictive mo- es. He totally discredited such arges. Whatever might be said of e present Prime Minister, no one could th justice accuse him of cruelty. In- ed, few men in political life had shown much consideration for his opponents, had been so little disposed to press avily upon beaten men. And with spect to the Home Secretary, who had ese prisoners under his special charge, might say with truth that he was a ntleman who would not consciously t his foot upon a worm. The only al ground why these men were kept in ison was, he had no doubt, because e Government thought that by so doing ey might deter others from engaging such dangerous and hazardous enter- izes as they had been connected with. the interests of the State, the Go- rnment doubtless considered that a olonged incarceration was required. hile he freely admitted that this was e opinion of the Cabinet, he at the me time entirely dissented from their licy and procedure. Legitimate and oderate punishment acted as a warning d corrective; but when punishment as carried beyond reasonable dimen- ons it became persecution, and pri- ners became martyrs. This was cer- inly the case with these unfortunate enians. The Irish people believed— d he thought justly—that any offence ey had committed against the State d been fully expiated, and the longer ey remained in penal servitude the ronger and more fervent would become e demand for their release. If the overnment wished to conciliate Irish litical feeling, he knew of no course ey could take to accomplish that end etter than by the release of these poor en. The Irish were a generous, an pulsive, and sympathetic race. He ppealed to the Ministers to act merci- lly and generously in this sad case, d he felt satisfied that their concession would be repaid by increased regard for the Constitution and by added attachment to England. When Hamlet told Polonius to see that the players were well cared for and properly bestowed, the garrulous old courtier replied that he would treat them "according to their desert." The Prince of Denmark exclaimed in answer, "Use every man after his desert, and who shall 'scape whipping? Use them after your own honour and dignity; the less they deserve the more merit there is in your bounty." He commended the political philosophy conveyed in that quotation to the consideration of Her Majesty's Ministers, and he hoped they would be able to see their way to assent to the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo.

MR. ANDERSON said, the last speaker, when he called these men political prisoners, and treated their offence as a political one, really begged the whole question. If it could be shown that they were political prisoners he should be at one with his hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen); but he had himself a year ago publicly questioned the Prime Minister and Home Secretary on the subject, and had been assured that even then no merely political prisoner was left among them. Two of the prisoners had been connected with the Manchester murder. They were murderers, and were, therefore, not entitled to receive any compassion whatever. Another of the prisoners, a colour-sergeant in his regiment —["Name!"]—he did not remember it just at present, but the fact was well-known, and the name was well-known to those hon. Members who called "Name!" and it was not necessary for him to tell hon. Members that the colour-sergeant was probably one of the most trusted man in the regiment next to the colonel. ["No, no!"] Well, at any rate the colour-sergeant in each company came in on all occasions between the officers and men, and occupied a highly confidential position. This colour-sergeant entered into a conspiracy to deliver up the arms of his regiment and to murder his officers. Men who did such things as these were not entitled to any kind of mercy or compassion. If, however, it could be shown that there was any one who was a political prisoner and nothing more, or who could be shown to be a military prisoner and nothing more, who had been duped by greater knaves than himself, let him off by all means; but when they had men like the three he mentioned to deal with, he said unhesitatingly they were not entitled to any mercy. He understood that all the men who were in the position of political prisoners, and to whom he himself had asked the Prime Minister to extend mercy, had now made their escape from Western Australia; therefore there was no reason for hon. Members to trouble themselves about them. Mercy might well be extended to other prisoners of the same class, if there were any, but not to criminals of the worst type.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY complained that the hon. Member for Glasgow had treated this subject in the most aggravating and disagreeable manner, throwing every obstacle in the way of mercy being shown to certain misguided men. The hon. Gentleman said he had in that House appealed to the Prime Minister to release certain classes of persons whom he, in his graciousness, was pleased to dignify with the title of political prisoners. Everyone who knew the circumstances was well aware that when the hon. Member interfered in this question he did so with the express purpose of preventing the action he asked for. The hon. Member brought forward the subject at an inopportune moment against the earnest expostulations and entreaties of those who felt that an appeal to the clemency of the Crown ought to be made on rational grounds, in a Christian spirit, and at a well-chosen moment. The hon. Gentleman chose, however, to intrude himself into this question, and did these men the greatest injury he could inflict on them by an injudicious and insincere advocacy. He would now bring back the attention of the House to the circumstances which had been alluded to that evening by his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power). It never entered into the minds of any of the men concerned in the Manchester outrage to murder the policeman Brett in putting a pistol to the lock of the door and endeavouring to force it open. They did not know an individual stood at the back of it. He hoped, in the interests of our common humanity, and especially in the interests of our common kingdom, that the right hon. Gentleman would not b too ready to brand with the name o murderers those unhappy persons wh were still remaining in prison on account of what was called the Mancheste outrage. The real murderers—if the were murderers—had been hanged, an the individuals now in prison only forme part of the crowd, and were identified a the trial by women of bad characte As to the soldiers, he would ask th House what would have become of ou liberties if there had not at times bee men in the Army who had broken thei oaths? He did not, in saying tha wish to excuse the conduct of the me to whom he was referring, for he full admitted that they ought to have bee subjected to a severe penalty for the o fence. They had, however, alread gone through twice the amount o punishment of others; and he believe there never was an act of mercy don by the Sovereign of these Realms whic would redound more to the honour o the Crown than the release of thes misguided men. They were tried by court-martial, and it would be creditabl to the officers of that Court if the would come forward and recommen those unhappy men to mercy. In Ireland, at the present moment, there wa no subject more interesting to the peopl than the sufferings of these prisoners Anyone who wished to speak on th subject would soon be surrounded by crowd of sympathizers. The same wa the case in Australia and America Seeing that these Fenian prisoners wer continually escaping, he asked th Home Secretary whether the time ha not come for the extension of He Majesty's clemency to the nine unfortunate prisoners who still remained i custody?

Mr. CALLAN, although he had no been in favour of having the presen Motion brought forward in the absenc of the acknowledged and trusted leade of the Irish people, yet was now gla that it had been made, seeing that i had evoked such eloquent support from the chivalrous and high-minded representative of, he believed he might say the North of England (Mr. Cowen) Neither was he sorry that the hon Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) and the hon. and gallant Member fo Brighton (General Shute), should agai have been afforded an opportunity o displaying what he might term, if the phrase was not un-Parliamentary, the truculence of their language. It was all very well to speak of these unfortunate men as murderers and conspirators, but they had not brought ruin upon thousands, as those who were engaged in the Emma Mine conspiracy, with which no honourable man would like to have been connected. The hon. and gallant Member for Brighton (General Shute) talked of whipping people at the cart's tail. Well, similar chivalric sentiments were held in former years by another military officer, known as "The Walking Gallows," which now seemed to permeate the mind of the retired General. ["No, no!"] He was sorry he was not retired.

Major DICKSON rose to Order, and asked if that was a proper way for one hon. Member to speak of another?

Mr. CALLAN said, if he had said something un-Parliamentary it was in error, but the sentiment in his mind remained the same. The Member for Brighton spoke of these men as a set of traitors.

General SHUTE rose to make an explanation, but the hon. Member declined to give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the strict rules of debate, the hon. Member in possession of the House is entitled to proceed with his observations until he has concluded. If, at their termination, the hon. and gallant Member desires to offer an explanation, no doubt he will, with the indulgence of the House, be at liberty to do so.

Mr. CALLAN: I would have yielded, but I wished to extend the same courtesy to the Member for Brighton which he wishes to extend to the Irish political prisoners.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out out that, according to the ordinary courtesies of debate, Members are spoken of as "hon. Members."

Mr. CALLAN said, he would, then, in accordance with ordinary courtesy, speak of the hon. Member as an "hon. Member." He thanked the Home Secretary for having allowed him to visit a prisoner who was no more guilty of murder than of putting nuggets into the Emma Mine.

Sir HENRY HOLLAND said, that although certainly the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) used strong language, he was not at all certain that it was too strong. These men committed an offence which could not be allowed to pass without condign punishment.

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT: I think such Members as are now present who do not come from Ireland will admit that it is not at all unreasonable that, considering the state of public opinion in Ireland with regard to this question, the hon. Member is fully justified in bringing it before the House; and I think, too, with the exception of a few words that have been uttered, we shall all agree that hon. Gentlemen from Ireland who have addressed the House have done it in a manner and with a feeling entirely befitting the subject which is before the House. I have regretted that on a former occasion when this matter was before us, I did not take the opportunity of saying what I have long thought with regard to the case which is called "The Manchester Outrage." There was in that case one man killed—one man shot—one fatal shot fired, and therefore it may be urged positively that only one man, in a certain sense, was guilty of murder. Three persons were hanged for that murder. I had, living in that neighbourhood, a very painful interview with the relatives of one of the three men who were hanged, and they were not willing to lay the blame upon either of the other two, but they felt very confidently that there were no sufficient grounds for believing that the prisoner in whose fate they were particularly interested was the one who fired the fatal shot. One of the three, I presume, was the guilty person, but the three were hanged. Now, it always appeared to me that the course pursued by the Home Office on that occasion was an unwise one. I am averse to capital punishment, as most Members of the House know; but in a case of this kind I think to hang three men for one fatal shot was a mistake—a mistake according to the order and practice of our law, and a great mistake when we look at it in its political aspect. On the occasion I have alluded to, when representations were made, it was denied that this was strictly a political case, or that any severity was resorted to because it was a political case; but I have always held the opinion that I held then, and hold now, that it was solely because it was a political case, that three men were hanged for the murder of one man. I recollect urging it in this way. If these three men had been out on a poaching expedition, and in the conflict that took place one keeper was killed by one shot, and three men were tried for it, I believe there is no Judge who would have sentenced, and no Home Secretary who would have thought it his duty to advise that these three men should be hanged for the offence. I believe that the three men were hanged because it was a political offence, and not because it was an ordinary murder of one man committed by one man and by one shot. The other day there was a case in my neighbourhood of an outrage committed by persons connected with a trade union in the neighbourhood of Bolton. Unfortunately a man was attacked by a number of his fellow-workmen and was killed. No doubt all who were present and maltreated the man were guilty of an illegal act, but it is difficult to say who it was that was guilty of the offence of destroying that man's life. Three, I think, were convicted, not of murder, but of manslaughter. It was an illegal act, and they were punished by various terms of imprisonment—from, I think, three to 15 years. Unless this was a political offence the evidence of murder was not very much different from the case I am now describing. I believe it was a great mistake. I said it then, and say it now, and I have, I say, always believed that the extremity of the law was put in force against three men, only one of whom—supposing the one who committed the offence was captured—caused the death of the unfortunate and lamented policeman. I would ask the House—I need not ask the hon. Members who come from Ireland, but I would ask those from England—whether they do not think that the punishment inflicted on these men, no one of whom, it is clear, actually fired the shot which killed that policeman, whether the punishment now suffered is not of itself sufficient; and whether the law, having avenged the murder of that man by the public execution of three men, has not been sufficiently satisfied; and whether the sympathies and the justice of the House might not be given with the proposition now before it for any further punishment to be withdrawn? I come to the other question—the question of the soldiers. I agree very much with the observations of my hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen). Let us consider from what class it is that the great bulk of your private soldiers are taken. Although soldiers take an oath—unhappily in all countries—I believe that is of very little avail. I think the time will come when oaths will be abolished. I believe that nothing has tended so much to destroy a regard for truth as the taking of oaths. A man may say many things when he is not on oath that he will not say when he is upon oath; but then it makes a difference in his mind as to the nature of truth, and I have always held the view that nothing has tended so much to destroy a regard for truth in this country and in all countries, as the constant and frequent imposition of oaths. I do not think, therefore, very much of the soldier's oath. The soldier's oath is not more important than the oath of any other man. To say a man is to be kept in perpetual imprisonment, or something approaching to it, because he breaks an oath is singular when men break oaths every day. I have heard men swear falsely—the House knows—upstairs, and the Committees knew they were swearing falsely. I think in this case too much importance should not be attributed to the fact that these men had taken an oath. You will bear in mind that there was great excitement in Ireland. There are a great number of men who do things during a time of excitement which, in times of no excitement, they would not do, and which afterwards they will regret. There was not only excitement in Ireland, but great excitement amongst the Irish population in the United States, and the excitement in Ireland was fired by the excitement in the United States. Many Irishmen, some native and some born in America, came home to this country, and they stirred up as much excitement as possible. It is within our knowledge that soldiers, like other men, are actuated by feelings and excitement of this nature, and are led into transactions which they afterwards greatly regret. Yet it is not necessary that the Government should year after year, and for many years, continue punishment when punishment seems to be no longer required by the changed condition of the country.

Many years have passed—I suppose 8 or 10—since this unfortunate event took place, and since that time a good deal has been done for Ireland. There can be no doubt that the material prosperity of that part of the United Kingdom is greater than it ever was at any former period in its history. There is excitement occasionally now, and there is political agitation. Some hon. Members in this House are the representatives of that agitation. Still, we must be glad to find that the agitation no longer takes the character of violence and insurrection, but that of the constitutional action which they have a perfect right to do. I think the House ought to congratulate itself that the time of insurrection and violence—as I hope it is—has passed away in Ireland. The speech, I think, of the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. Kenelm Digby) was one calculated to have a great effect upon every Member of the House who heard it; and nothing could be more moderate, more reasonable, or more just than the tone in which he appealed to the Government and the House on behalf of the prisoners. It cannot but have had some effect on the right hon. Gentleman at the Home Office. He can have no object in keeping these men as prisoners. No Home Secretary has any personal object in dispensing the law in any way hardly or cruelly to those who happen to come under his notice; but perhaps the Home Office may act upon the policy that with regard to the broken oaths of soldiers mercy is a thing not to be thought of. I disagree with that altogether. I think there is nothing grander in a Monarchy, nothing nobler in a Government than mercy. I must say for myself—I say it as an Englishman, and I am not actuated by violent feeling, which I am sorry to say some persons in Ireland still show in their enthusiasm in favour of these men; but I think that, looking altogether to the number of years since this transaction took place, I am quite certain it would redound to the honour of the Crown, and that it would be a very just act on the part of the present Government if the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues could see their way to advise the Crown in favour of the liberation of these prisoners. I cannot think that such an act would be without its effect in Ireland. The Irish people are very different from all other people if they would not be favourably influenced by a merciful consideration of this case. I think the way in which it has been discussed to-night—the unanimity of the Irish Members, the certainty we have that in speaking as they do they represent the vast majority of the people of Ireland, have vindicated their right to bring this question before the House; and I should be extremely glad if the right hon. Gentleman could give them some hope that the Government would consider their case. If it should be necessary for the House to go to a division, I should feel it my duty to vote for the Motion.

MR. STACPOOLE supported the Motion, which he hoped would be adopted as an act of clemency. It would be received by the people of Ireland with gratitude.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bright) had alluded to a proceeding in which he (Mr. Hardy) had the misfortune to hear a considerable part. The right hon. Gentleman had thought right to say that the Home Secretary at the time of the Manchester outrage took upon himself to hang three men. Now that seemed to him a most unreasonable and improper statement of the duties of the Home Secretary. That Minister never took upon himself anything in the nature of an execution. His duty was simply to advise the exercise of the prerogative of mercy if he thought there were grounds for it. The force of law was absolute in itself, and he had nothing whatever to do with it. But that was not the only part of the right hon. Gentleman's statement to which he felt it his duty to refer. On the subject of the murder itself the right hon. Gentleman had laid down principles which were of an absolutely dangerous character. It was perfectly true that at Manchester only one man was killed and that three men were hanged, and that some perished who did not fire the shot; but was it to be maintained for a moment in an Assembly of men of sense and judgment that the aiders and abettors in a murder who had gone to a certain place armed and determined to shed blood, rather than forego the object they had in view, were not equally guilty with the man who actually did the deed? The man who fired the shot in the Manchester outrage might possibly have been the least guilty of those concerned in it. No one who had any acquaintance with the proceedings of our criminal Courts could fail to be aware that the actual agent in a crime was often a person employed by the real culprits—a mere instrument in their hands, so to speak; and the right hon. Gentleman certainly seemed to him to be putting forth a most dangerous doctrine when he contended that the persons who on the occasion of the Manchester outrage went about with and used loaded revolvers were absolutely guiltless simply because from no self-constraint on their part, but simply by good fortune, they had escaped shedding blood. Shots were fired which endangered life, and although only one took effect, the persons who that day went out armed and prepared for murder were all in the eye of justice and common sense equally guilty. The right hon. Gentleman had said that he was the advocate of the abolition of capital punishment, and he (Mr. Hardy) thought that had a prejudicial influence upon the right hon. Gentleman's opinion, for he looked at the matter not in the light of law, but in that of sentiment. He (Mr. Hardy) did not say that that was not an honour to him; but a man should not allow himself to be prejudiced so as to go against the law, not only of this country, but of every civilized country, that all those who went to carry out an object at the cost of life were every one guilty. As the Home Secretary at the time referred to, he (Mr. Hardy) felt that to a certain extent the right hon. Gentleman's observations affected him personally. But his opinion then, as now, was that in the case of the men convicted for murder there was no call for his interference. The prerogative of mercy was exercised towards some who were present on that occasion; but with regard to the others, neither the Judges, nor those who were engaged in the trial, had any doubt as to the guilt which attached to each and all of them. It was to be remembered that the crime was characterized by an amount of audacity which was happily uncommon in this country. An armed party went forth with the avowed object of effecting the rescue of a prisoner from custody, and did not hesitate for the accomplishment of their ends to kill an officer against whom personally they entertained no animosity whatever. Had he not allowed the law to take its course in such a case he felt that he should have been betraying his duty both to the Crown and to the country. There was another point on which it was necessary to touch. The right hon. Gentleman, with a strong sentimental feeling, said he thought lightly of a soldier's oath. Again, he (Mr. Hardy) had to say that was a most dangerous statement. A soldier's oath had been regarded in all times as of special solemnity and importance. It was quite true they were all bound by allegiance to the Sovereign; but was it to be said that a man who broke a special trust and obligation which he had undertaken was not more guilty than one who had not so bound himself? A Member of that House who broke his sworn allegiance was no doubt in as bad a position as the soldier; but, at the same time, it could not be said that the soldier was in any better position than such a Member would be. In the particular instance mentioned by the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) there was the greatest possible aggravation of the soldier's offence. He did not believe the case of the soldiers was one which would have been treated differently in any civilized country, except, perhaps, in this respect—that death would have been substituted for imprisonment. Well, the right hon. Gentleman formed part of the late Government. He (Mr. Hardy) did not say that the right hon. Gentleman did not urge upon the Members of that Government the views he had expressed that night. But, at all events, he did not then express those views publicly. In respect to the treatment of these prisoners the late Government did not see fit to take the step which hon. Members on the other side of the House were now advocating; and he could say that the present Government had not followed their example without seeing what they deemed good cause.

Captain NOLAN did not understand that the right hon. Member for Birmingham sought to accuse the right hon. Gentleman opposite of being a cruel Home Secretary. The contention of the right hon. Gentleman simply was that the punishment inflicted showed that the crime was regarded as a political and not as an ordinary one. With reference to the speech of the hon. and gallant Member for Brighton (General Shute), he might remark that he was well known as an excellent officer. The hon. and gallant Member for Brighton was a strict disciplinarian, and it was not surprising if he was in favour of flogging; but if we were to have a system of short service, under which our soldiers were to be thrown back upon the people and to mix with them, it would be found necessary, as well as politic, for us to be merciful and liberal. It was but a small favour that was now asked of a great country that could afford to be generous. There was no valid reason to be urged why these men should not have mercy extended to them. The people of Ireland were bound to use every legitimate effort to get these men released, and if their appeals for mercy were rejected, could it be expected that they would act generously in time of need? That discussion had shown the supporters of the Motion who were their friends and who were their foes, and the House might rest assured that that question could not pass away from the minds of the Irish constituencies or be without its effect on the Irish vote in the English constituencies until these men had been released. They were bound to use every constitutional means to get them out of prison.

General SHUTE expressed his astonishment at finding himself described by the last speaker as an advocate of flogging. He had always detested corporal punishment, and when he had used the phrase "whipped like a child at the cart's tail," he had only wished to convey to the House that he looked upon Irish insurrections as mere burlesques.

Captain NOLAN retracted what he had said about the hon. and gallant Gentleman in connection with flogging.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, nobody would advocate forgiveness or leniency to murderers; but although these persons were engaged in an offence which the law technically called murder, the result of the trial was to send those men to penal servitude, instead of subjecting them to capital punishment; and why? because the Judges who tried them did not consider that the offence which they actually committed made them amenable to the punishment for murder. At the present moment Ireland was in a peaceful condition, and there was no reason to expect that any other outbreak would occur. Under these circumstances, if the hon. Member divided the House, he should vote in favour of the Resolution.

Mr. MARTEN said, there was great inconvenience in discussing in that House questions which involved the Prerogative of mercy, and no hon. Member, whether English or Irish, could approach the subject without considerable difficulty. A great portion of the argument of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bright), was not addressed directly to the particular question now before them; for it was directed rather against the infliction of capital punishment, and against imposing oaths for judicial or military purposes. The discussion, also, as to those who suffered capital punishment for the Manchester outrage was not pertinent to the present question. It was not the fact that the nine persons who were now in prison were confined as political prisoners. Two were connected with the Manchester outrage, and had been sentenced to death for the crime of murder, but their sentence had been commuted into the punishment they were now undergoing. Five of them had been convicted of military offences under the Articles of War which were of a very grave character. With regard to the observations of the right hon. Member for Birmingham on the subject of the sanctity of an oath, he thought that the right hon. Gentleman would admit that, at all events, an oath was entitled to the same respect as a solemn affirmation. The soldier took upon himself in the most solemn form known to the law an obligation which in this case had been violated, and he was punishable, therefore, under the Mutiny Act, which was passed by that House every year. The other two prisoners had been tried for treason-felony, and therefore it would appear that the majority of the prisoners now in gaol had been tried either for military offences or for crimes ordinarily known to the law, and were therefore in no sense political offenders. He altogether denied that the men who had been convicted of murder had been punished as political offenders. They would in all probability have been punished in the same manner if the outrage of which they were guilty had been one without any political aspect. He was most reluctant to say one word which might seem harsh to hon. Members on the opposite benches; but when a Resolution of this kind was forced upon the

House, and supported by such speeches as that of the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen) it was a duty to speak out. The hon. Member had compared Washington and Emmett—the one rebel became a hero, a patriot, who commanded universal admiration; the other died, a political martyr, for the crime of treason. He would remind the hon. Member of the lines—

> "Treason doth never prosper: what's the reason?
> Why, when it prospers, none dare call it treason."

Those who disturbed the peace of the country and sought to overthrow the Government must, when they failed, pay the penalty of treason, even although, had they succeeded, they would have occupied a different position. A Resolution of this kind was not, he thought, calculated to benefit the prisoners or to facilitate the exercise of the Prerogative. The grounds on which it had been brought forward were certainly not such as to recommend it to his support, and if pressed to a division he would vote against it.

Dr. WARD said, that the Government were asked to be generous and merciful towards a few unfortunate men who in a sense foolishly had loved their country "not wisely, but too well." Was it wise or politic for the sake of keeping these nine men in prison to keep up a spirit of revolt in Ireland? They had liberated the men who had fostered the Fenian conspiracy, and surely they could not with reason keep in those who had been misled by them. In continuing to punish these persons the Government were guilty of the most impolitic conduct in respect to a people who were disposed to be loyal, but who were prevented being so by the conduct of the Government.

Mr. MELDON could not accept the doctrine laid down by the Secretary of State for War as to the law in the present case. What was the crime these men committed? There was not a tittle of evidence to show that they went into that crowd with the intention to commit murder. If it had not been for the excitement existing in this country at the time, and in which the Judge and jury shared, he believed that not one of those three men would have been hanged. The people of Ireland felt that these men were martyrs, and in keeping up their imprisonment the Government were establishing a nucleus of conspiracy and disorder. He maintained that the law had been amply vindicated; while the release of the Fenian prisoners would do more than any other measure to put an end to agitation, and give satisfaction to Ireland.

Mr. B. WHITWORTH, as an Englishman who had a large interest in the material prosperity of the country, could safely say that the Government would do a great service to that prosperity if they granted the request, which was almost unanimous, of the Irish people. He happened to be one of the jurymen in the case of the Manchester murder. No doubt, a great crime was committed; but he did not think it was a wise thing to have hanged more than the man Allen, who fired the shot. When he (Mr. Whitworth) stood for the borough of Kilkenny some 18 months ago, he was represented as the "Manchester hangman." The Fenian element called a meeting to denounce him; but the bulk of the people of Kilkenny would not listen to what they had to say, thus showing they had no sympathy with Fenians. He was satisfied that mercy might be safely extended to the Fenian prisoners still in confinement. He believed Fenianism was comparatively a dead letter in Ireland, and the only thing that could revive it was a refusal on the part of the Government to adopt a policy of clemency and mercy.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Plunket) observed, that although Her Majesty's Government were in this matter only pursuing the course marked out by their Predecessors, yet it was not on that ground he desired to defend the conclusion at which they had arrived. The ground on which the release of these prisoners was demanded before the expiration of their sentences was that they were political prisoners; but he was prepared to show that not one of the prisoners now undergoing imprisonment came under that category. The hon. Gentleman who seconded the Motion (Mr. Kenelm Digby) did not put his case on that ground, but contended that, now that all excitement and danger had passed away, the time had come when the Government might safely act as those who preceded them had done. But the late Government had arrived at the same conclusion with reference to the very same men. The individuals now in prison were the same as those who were not released, and on the ground that they were not political prisoners. He need not trouble the House at any length in reference to the history of the men whose release was sought by the present Motion. They were eight in number; five were soldiers, all of whom were convicted not of treason-felony or of treasonable offences, but of breaches of the Articles of War. M'Carthy was convicted because, having knowledge of a mutiny, he did not give information of it to his commanding officer. The next two were convicted of mutinous conduct and desertion, and the others for similar offences. Two of the other prisoners were engaged in the murder of the policeman Brett at Manchester, and, having been condemned to death, were subsequently reprieved and let off with sentences of penal servitude. It must be clear, therefore, that the offences committed by those persons who were released and those who still remained in prison were widely different, and called for different treatment. With regard to the legal argument with regard to the cases of the Manchester murderers, as urged by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright), he must observe it was altogether inconsistent with the law of England, that because only one life was lost in a murderous outrage, he only who was party to the actual killing of the man by striking the fatal blow should be punished for it. The only other of the prisoners whose case it was necessary for him particularly to refer to was Davitt, who was convicted of treason-felony for having, in conjunction with another person named Wilson, who had been let out upon licence (in consequence of the evidence against him not being of so damaging a character) supplied arms to the Fenians throughout the country. It was impossible that a deliberate offence of this character could be visited with anything less than severe punishment, especially when it was remembered that it was committed after the great excitement had passed away and the outbreaks had almost come to an end. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), in reply to a Question, had stated on the 25th of July, 1873, that this man could not be regarded as a political prisoner. The right hon. Member for Greenwich said—

> "In ordinary convictions for political offences we can positively and confidently say that when once public excitement and hazard have passed away, it may be well to stretch a point on the side of mercy; but we are not able to do so in this case."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxvii. 998.]

The contemptible character of an outbreak did not necessarily lessen the gravity of the offence; and the hopelessness of such an enterprize ought to enter into the calculations of a man who deliberately aimed at the overthrow of an established Government. But, however that might be, it was impossible to conceive of a more wanton and reckless proceeding, or one more dangerous to society, than that of a man who, after the excitement which accompanied the Fenian outbreak had passed away, and when there was not the shadow of a hope or a possibility of success, and when even the clemency of the Crown had been asked for and granted to those who had been engaged in a previous attempt of the same kind, had been preparing for a renewal of the outbreak. There were also two unfortunate men now in prison who had been convicted of murder according to the law of the land. In conclusion, he would express his conviction that if the true character of the offences committed by those persons was understood throughout the country he believed that the sympathy felt towards them would take a different direction, and that many who now asked for their release would see that that was not an urgent demand founded either in justice or in policy, and would leave to the Executive Government the function which undoubtedly belonged to it of considering when, if at all, the Prerogative of clemency should be exercised.

MR. JOHN BRIGHT explained that he had not called in question the state of the law.

THE O'CONOR DON pointed out that whatever might be the legal and military technicalities connected with the case of the soldiers in question, they were guilty of exactly the same offence in a political point of view as their civilian fellow-prisoners, and they would never be looked upon by the Irish people as having been sentenced for any other offence but the same political offence for which those very civilians had been pardoned. He did not know whether the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) meant to press his Motion to a division; but whether he did or not, he had done good service by bringing the subject before the House and eliciting such an expression of opinion as that which was conveyed in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright). It was now utterly impossible that those men could be detained much longer in prison, and their being set at liberty was only a question of time.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was unwilling that the debate should close without a few words from himself, because he could assure the House, without the slightest reserve, that he always felt the deep responsibility of matters connected with life and death—and he hoped the House would always hesitate to interfere with the individual act of the Minister advising the Crown on such matters. Nothing could be more dangerous to the liberty of the subject than the interference of the House under such circumstances. This was not the case of the responsibility of an individual Minister; it was not the case so much of an individual Government as of many Governments. It was not this Government alone which had refused to take action in this matter; all it had done was to follow the precedent set it by the last Government. One thing he had observed for several years, and he still observed it that night—namely, that in the mind of a great many of the Irish people there was no difference or distinction between those whose sentences had been remitted already and those who still remained in prison, and they did not see any difference between those who had been found guilty of murder and those found guilty of other offences. What alone would content Ireland, it appeared, was the release of the whole of the prisoners. ["Hear, hear!"] Well, let that be clearly understood. It was not the release of one or two prisoners, but it was the release of the whole of them, whether they had been found guilty of murder or any other offence. [Mr. Mitchell Henry: We will take half a slice if we cannot get the whole.] But he (Mr. Assheton Cross) was stating the case of the Irish people. The late Government as well as the present Government had totally denied that there were any political offenders now in prison. As regarded the soldiers in prison, although he quite admitted that every citizen of this country was bound by his high allegiance to the service of the Queen and State, yet when a soldier had taken the oath of allegiance he was bound by a higher duty, if he might so say. To allow the soldiers out would imply that other soldiers who were in prison for like offences should also be liberated, and, in the minds of those who had expiated kindred crimes, there would be the feeling that they had been wronged. One observation made in the course of that debate would, he hoped, never again be uttered within those walls. An hon. Gentleman opposite had said it was owing to some Princely influence that these prisoners were not set at liberty. He wished distinctly to assert that he alone was responsible in the matter. And now he would refer to what he must call the Manchester murder. That was not a political offence. If it had been, he should have been the first to advise the Crown to set the men at liberty. The doctrine of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Bright) was that those men were not guilty of murder, because they did not fire the actual shot. [Mr. John Bright, interposing, remarked that he had never said anything of the sort.] He (Mr. Assheton Cross) had understood the right hon. Gentleman blamed his right hon. Friend (Mr. Hardy), who was then Home Secretary, because three men were executed for the murder, although only one of them had fired the shot. That was a doctrine which would not bear examination or the test of common sense.

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT explained that he had not contested the law at all. What he said was, that if it had not been a political case, or if there had been no political complication connected with it, three men would not have been hanged. In the case of a poaching affray, he was sure that the course of the Home Office had been different, and he used that argument to show that this was really a political case; but he did not contest the law, or the fairness of the trial, or the legality of the sentence, or the legality of what the Home Secretary did.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, the right hon. Gentleman blamed his right hon. Friend for having allowed the three men to hanged. The right hon. Gentleman did not question the legality of it, because he could not do so; but he blamed the way in which his right hon. Friend had exercised his discretion in the matter. His contention was that if three or more men went out with a common intent to do an unlawful act, with a predetermination to carry out their common purpose at all hazards, even at risk of life, or of a number of lives, although only one might fire the shot, all the others were equally guilty. In the case of the Manchester murder the jury distinctly found that the prisoners had a common intent to effect their unlawful purpose at all hazards, and consequently they were justly found guilty of murder. It was owing to the clemency of the Crown, exercised through the discretion of his right hon. Friend, that the two men now in prison were not executed. He did not understand how it was that those who guided Irish feeling could not point out to the Irish people, that if these men, irrespective of a political offence, did attack the van with murderous intent, they were guilty, in the eye of the law of England, of murder, and must suffer for it. It now only remained for him to allude to the case of Michael Davitt, whose companion Wilson had been discharged from custody, having worked out his sentence in the ordinary course. When he became Home Secretary the case of Davitt caused him considerable anxiety; but on inquiry he found that the difference between the offences of the two prisoners had been carefully considered by the Judge who tried them. The reason why one was sentenced to seven and the other to 15 years' penal servitude was that there was in the mind of Davitt a direct intention of private assassination which could not possibly be referred to the question of a political offence. With reference to the remarks of the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power), he would observe that the treatment of these prisoners was as lenient as that of any other convicts who were in confinement at the present time. The application for permission to visit them was refused because it would interfere with the discipline of the prison, and deprive the prisoners of the visits of those who were entitled to see them at the proper season. If these men were political prisoners they would have been let out, as other political offenders had been let out. As the late Government decided, so the present Government had decided, that there was no reason why the prisoners should be set at liberty.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER, after the debate which had taken place, asked leave to withdraw the Motion. ["No!"]

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 51; Noes 117: Majority 66.

POLLUTION OF RIVERS BILL—[Bill 186.]

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt.*)

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [1st August] proposed on Consideration of the Bill, as amended; and which Amendment was, in page 3, line 13, to leave out the words "at a reasonable cost." — (*Mr. Lyon Playfair.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Debate *resumed.*

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Another Amendment made.

Another Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 42, to leave out from the word "locality," to the word "manufacture," in page 4, line 8."—(*Mr. Lyon Playfair.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Another Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 14, to leave out from the word "proceedings," to the word "offence," in line 16, both inclusive.—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Other Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. William Henry Smith, Bill to continue various Expiring Laws, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. William Henry Smith and Mr. Secretary Cross.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 281.]

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 2nd August, 1876.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading—Referred to a Select Committee*—Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment (Dublin) * [207].
Committee—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2) [194], *debate adjourned.*
Committee—Report—Forfeiture Relief * [259]; Tralee Savings Bank * [275].

PARLIAMENTARY AGENCY.

RESOLUTIONS.

MR. RAIKES (Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means) said, he desired to call attention to the Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Agency, and to move certain Resolutions, Notice of which he had placed on the Paper, founded on that Report. The Notice he had given was, no doubt, of the shortest—but the necessities of the case made it inconvenient for the Chairman of the other House and himself to take part in the deliberations of a Committee or to devote attention to the matter at an early period of the Session, and the delay which had occurred was therefore unavoidable. It was impossible for him to indicate to the House the line he proposed to take until Saturday, when he placed the Notice on the Paper; but though he thought it desirable that the Report of the Joint Committee should be discussed before the close of the Session, he did not, considering the shortness of the Notice, propose to press for a final decision upon it. There were three principal matters with which the Report dealt—first, the constitution of the roll of practitioners; secondly, the mode of ascertaining the fitness of persons to be admitted to practice as Parliamentary Agents; and thirdly, the question of the division of profits between Agents and solicitors. The Committee, therefore, recommended that the names of all persons authorized to practise as Parliamentary Agents should be entered on a roll to be kept by the Clerk of the Parliaments. With regard to the constitution of the roll, the Committee had not attempted to interfere with existing interests; they therefore recommended that the roll should comprise, in the first instance, the names of all persons who during this or the preceding Parliament had introduced and conducted any Private Bill through both Houses, and of such other persons as the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the Speaker of the House of Commons should have, for special reasons, considered to be entitled to be placed on it. With regard to future admissions, it was a matter of some difficulty and delicacy. It was, above all things, desirable that Parliament should not be suspected of the design of preventing any man from obtaining the means of earning an honest livelihood, or of any desire of establishing a monopoly in a particular class;—the question was how to reconcile the interests of the public with private interests. He did not think there would be much difference of opinion as to the proposal that there should be a recognized body of Parliamentary Agents;—it therefore became of importance to lay down rules by which the *status* of Parliamentary Agents might be obtainable. As he had said, the recommendation of the Committee was that there should be placed on the roll all persons who during the present or the preceding Parliament had conducted any Private Bill through both Houses, and of such other persons as the Chairman of the Lords' Committees or the Speaker might for special reasons think fit to be admitted. Representations had been made to the Committee on behalf of solicitors, such as solicitors of Railway Companies and other Incorporations, who were necessarily largely engaged in Parliamentary practice, but who in preference to conducting that business through their own office delegated to regular Parliamentary Agents the conduct of their business through Parliament. It seemed but fair that solicitors in this position ought not to be excluded from the roll because of the largeness of their practice; but he had little doubt their case would come within the special consideration of the Chairman of Committees of the other House and the Speaker. Here arose another point as to the question of opposition in Committees. A mistaken impression had got abroad that the Committee wished to restrict the persons who should be admitted to oppose Bills in Committee to those who were on the roll of Parliamentary Agents. This was not so. The Committee were unanimous in recommending that any person, whether on the roll or not, should conduct the opposition to any Bill on entering into the same engagements as might be required in the rules prescribed in respect of Parliamentary Agents. No doubt they were of opinion that in most cases it was desirable that the opposition should be conducted by properly qualified practitioners. The second important point to which the Report called attention was a test of fitness for the future. And here he must admit there was a strange irony in fate when he, who had never hesitated to say that he had no confidence in any examination as a test of fitness, found himself advocating examination in this instance. He thought that a much more effectual test would be service in the office of an experienced person; but that was open to the serious objection that it would confine to a few, who would be able to exact large fees, the business of educating their successors, and that a monopoly would be created. The apprenticeship test was therefore abandoned, and they had to fall back on examination; and though he had no great confidence in any examination as a test of general fitness, there could be no doubt, where the special knowledge of an expert was required, it was much easier to apply this test successfully than in a wider field. It was stated by the Taxing Officer of the House of Lords, who had an experience of 40 or 50 years, that he could find out in 10 minutes whether a person was versed in Parliamentary procedure or not. It had been suggested in a Memorial of the Incorporated Law Society that barristers and solicitors only should be permitted to practise as Parliamentary Agents—but the Committee had refused to adopt that recommendation. Originally the Agents were not solicitors, but clerks of the House; and when, in 1836, it was decided that clerks of the House should no longer practise as Agents, many of them surrendered their clerkships in order to practise as before, and founded those most respectable firms by which the largest part of Parliamentary business was conducted at the present day. Some of the best Parliamentary Agents had not been solicitors. It was therefore thought desirable that Parliament should institute some test of special fitness of its own. The Committee, therefore, recommended that any barrister, advocate, solicitor, writer to the signet, or graduate of an University, and any person who should have passed a certain examination, to be conducted by the Civil Service Commissioners, should be allowed to present himself for a special examination. This examination was to be conducted by Examiners to be named from time to time by the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker, and was to be specially directed to the fitness of the candidates for practice as Parliamentary Agents. The persons who should pass this examination would then be placed on the roll. A much more vexed question was as to the division of profits. A country solicitor believed himself capable of doing anything—and he would probably be very unfit for his business if he did not; he conducted cases through the Courts of Chancery, Common Law, and Bankruptcy, and therefore he considered himself capable of conducting a Private Bill through Parliament. And there were many country solicitors who, taking this view of their capacity, regarded their Parliamentary Agents as they did their London Law Agents—namely, as delegates with whom they might fairly arrange the terms of their remuneration. The Committee were of a different opinion. They were of opinion that this system led to great abuses—to exorbitant expenses in some cases, to great and unnecessary delay, and frequently to disastrous failures. They therefore recommended that the Special Rules regulating the admission and practice of Parliamentary Agents, to be drawn up by the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker, should absolutely forbid this practice, that any Agent who should be proved guilty of the violation of the rules in this respect should be summarily removed from the roll. Under the present system the country solicitor who employed a Parliamentary Agent considered himself entitled to half the fees, because, he said, if he had resided in London he could conduct the Bills themselves, and receive the whole of the fees. But where special fitness was required this would not be the case. Theoretically the solicitor was supposed to prepare all the preliminary documents—practically the business was done by one man, the Agent. The solicitor was entitled to charges over and above what were paid to the Parliamentary Agent—but here, besides what he was entitled to as solicitor, he took what the Parliamentary Agent was entitled to—he took double fees. Suppose, for instance, a Bill consisting of 100 folios. The solicitor was entitled to 2*s*. a folio, or £10, for drawing it, and the Parliamentary Agent to a further fee for "settling" it—as in ordinary legal business the solicitor drew a deed, and counsel was paid for settling it. Here, in point of fact, the Agent did both — but the country solicitor received his charges for doing nothing, besides half the Agent's charge. This system could not be equitable in itself; but it led to further injustice, for the Agent was obliged to invent business and make charges which would otherwise not be incurred. The client and Agent were both sufferers by the practice. Here was an instance. A Bill affecting the interests of a very important borough was introduced; it was promoted by the town clerk, who was paid by salary, not by fees. The town clerk, however, made a charge upon the Parliamentary Agent, who, thinking him to be a customer it would not be wise to disoblige, paid him 100 guineas out of his fees. The matter was brought before the Town Council, which ordered the money to be paid into the borough fund. The leading firms of Parliamentary Agents entirely condemned the practice and refused to adopt it. Mr. Theodore Martin, who appeared before the Committee as the representative of the Parliamentary Agents' Society—a body comprising all the leading firms and most experienced practitioners—gave this evidence—

"118. And among those rules, if they were made obligatory upon the profession, I presume that you would include a rule against the division of profits?—Certainly; I think that to divide profits is utterly vicious in principle, and I have seen it operate very badly. Of course you cannot always, in a numerous society, secure high character; the best you can do is to make the risks of temptation as small as possible. As I have already stated, I consider that the scale of fees is not too high; in fact, no man could conduct his business properly, I am sure, if it were to be reduced. If a man gives up half of those legitimate earnings the temptation is great to replace them by some other process; that process, as one has seen it in practice, is by creating unnecessary work, and in our profession it is quite possible to do that. I will illustrate it in this way: Supposing that a local solicitor wanting to come to London, makes his Bill an excuse for it, and says, 'I want to come to London and see you about this Bill.' There is nothing whatever to see him about; the Bill is probably settled, but he comes to London and stays here; he calls upon me, and I charge for receiving him and talking about his Bill. He still remains in London, and something else comes into his mind, and he comes to me again the next day, and so charges are accumulated without any real benefit to the client. The temptation, of course, lies in this and similar directions to a man to compensate himself for what he has given away; and I think that the officials of the House under whose eyes these things come can give evidence of its working in the way I have indicated. Take another case—namely, that of witnesses. An experienced Parliamentary Agent knows well what class of evidence is likely to have weight with a Committee. The local solicitors send up a bundle of papers with the proofs of the witnesses; we read them, and come to the conclusion: If all that these proofs contain were said, what would be the good of it? It would not influence the Committee a bit. We therefore write down and say, 'Don't send those people;' but a man who has an interest, along with the local solicitor, has sacrificed his independence, and he will not deal with them in the same way that I or others who do not participate in profits do. In the first place, we want to do business efficiently in the least time and at the least cost. That is the idea which I think that every member of our society has steadily in view; but if you allow anybody to have an interest such as I have indicated, the temptation becomes very great not to conduct business upon this principle.

"119. I understand you to say that upon the whole you regard the practice of dividing profits between Parliamentary Agents and solicitors as essentially different from the practice of dividing profits between solicitors and their London agents?—Quite so, upon an obvious principle. A solicitor in the country gets his London solicitor to do certain formal things, which he, the solicitor in the country, can do quite as well if he chooses to come to London to do them. But he is not in the position that a Parliamentary Agent is in, who at very many important stages of a Bill is more in the position of a counsel to advise, than of solicitor, and the work which he does, if his existence is to be retained at all, is work of a special kind, quite distinct from that of a solicitor. Therefore the solicitor has no right to participate in the profits of the Parliamentary Agent. Moreover, Parliament itself has settled the matter, because Parliament has fixed a scale in minute detail for the charges that a solicitor is to make for Parliamentary business quite distinct from those of a Parliamentary Agent. The solicitor gets his legitimate profits; he has the preparation of the case in the country, the service of notices, &c., all very remunerative things, with which we have nothing whatever to do; he is well paid for this work, and therefore he is perfectly well provided for, and should not be allowed to have any interest with the Parliamentary Agent. But the great point upon which I dwell is that it has a tendency to corrupt the mind of a Parliamentary Agent, which I think ought not to be allowed."

After quoting from the Petition of the Parliamentary Agents Society, which embodied views very similar to those expressed by Mr. Martin, he (Mr. Raikes) continued to say that he had no wish to push the matter forward at the present moment in opposition to the wish of any considerable number of Members of the House: at the same time, it was a matter of much importance, and the settlement of it ought not to be delayed longer than was absolutely necessary. There could be no doubt that for the profession of a Parliamentary Agent certain special qualifications were necessary; but it was equally important that Agents should be men in whose character implicit trust could be placed. Another point of importance was that in both Houses definite rules of procedure should be laid down and followed. In the House of Lords there were no such rules at present, for the obvious reason that Lord Redesdale was a sort of embodied code; but the noble Lord was mortal, and it was important that the results of his long experience and wide knowledge should be gathered together for the guidance of those who might succeed him. While he was willing for the present to postpone the consideration of this question, he hoped the House would not allow the result of much unprejudiced and painstaking labour on the part of the Committee to be lost to the country. The hon. Member concluded by moving the first of the following Resolutions:—

"1. That this House, having considered the Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Agency, is of opinion that it is desirable to lay down more definite rules respecting the practice of Parliamentary Agency, and the regulation of the conduct of Parliamentary Agents.

"2. That, in the opinion of this House, the efficient conduct of private Bills through Parliament will be further secured by the establishment of some standard of general and special fitness in the case of persons seeking hereafter to be admitted to practise as Parliamentary Agents.

"3. That this House, having regard to the objects sought to be attained by the establishment of the existing scale of fees for Parliamentary Agents, considers that the division between agents and solicitors of profits obtained by services rendered by the former to the latter is contrary to the intention of Parliament in fixing that scale.

"4. That Mr. Speaker be requested, in concert with the authorities of the other House of Parliament, to frame rules to give effect to these Resolutions."

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That this House, having considered the Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Agency, is of opinion that it is desirable to lay down more definite rules respecting the practice of Parliamentary Agency and the regulation of the conduct of Parliamentary Agents."—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA, in moving, as an Amendment to the Resolution, to leave out all the words after the word "That," in order to add the words—

"At this late period of the Session, and without further time for consideration of the Report of the Joint Committee, it is not expedient to delegate the powers of Parliament for the purpose of constituting Parliamentary Agency as a distinct profession,"

said, he sympathized with the objects which the Committee and Lord Redesdale had in view; but he believed there was a difference of opinion in the other House as to the general policy of the legislation proposed to be founded on the Report of that Committee. The question had only been brought under their immediate consideration during the last 48 hours, and the subject to which it referred was too great to be satisfactorily dealt with after so short a period for thought concerning it, and at the fag-end of the Session. There was much in the details of the Report to which he objected—and among other things that, if carried into effect, it would create an entirely new profession—a proceeding contrary to the policy which the Legislature had pursued under analogous circumstances, as in the case of the proctors in the Consistorial Courts, when those Courts were thrown open to solicitors generally. No less an authority than the Lord Chancellor had expressed an opinion that many of the details of the scheme contemplated were fraught with danger, and after that, it would be unwise, as well as unfair to press the Resolution, delegating as it did such an enormous power to the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees in the other House, and to the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair. Therefore, he begged to move the Amendment.

MR. CHARLEY seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out all the words after the word "That," in order to add the words "at this late period of the Session, and without further time for consideration of the Report of the Joint Committee, it is not expedient to delegate the powers of Parliament for the purpose of constituting Parliamentary Agency as a distinct profession."—(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT thought the statement of the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means was one which would satisfy all persons interested in the matter that the intention of the Select Committee was to deal fairly with all the interest involved. It would also satisfy hon. Members that the subject was too large a one to be satisfactorily settled at that late period of the Session. The Report of the Committee had been but a very few days in the hands of hon. Members, and now they were called upon to say that the House had considered the Report, and were of opinion that it was desirable to make some changes. Perhaps they ought to read through the Blue Books on the day of delivery, but that they could not do. The House was now in a state of liquidation and winding up its accounts, and it would not be well to open any new ones. That was sufficient to justify the withdrawal of the Resolutions till next year, by which time those who were interested in them would be able to give them due attention. He would not discuss the Resolutions, but would merely remark that if the proposed rules were made they would establish a monopoly. They were not quite consistent, as it was proposed to allow all the present agents to practise whether they were fit or not. One feature which he missed from the speech of his hon. Friend was any statement of the grievances which called for an alteration of the present system. During the time when he practised at the Parliamentary Bar he always found the Agents to be men of capacity and integrity, and he had come to the conclusion that in a Parliamentary Agent it was not so much capacity as character that was required, and this could not be given by any system of examination such as was proposed in the Report of the Select Committee. While he did not approve the system of Agents and solicitors dividing the fees, he did not think any rule that might be drawn would put a stop to it. If a solicitor had business to offer to an Agent he would always make his own terms, on the same principle that publishers, for instance, regulated their trade allowances. He hoped the further proceeding would be postponed for the present Session.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, the House was indebted to the Joint Committee for the attention they had given to this subject, and to the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means for the very clear way in which he had stated the proposals of the Committee. He agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Sir William Harcourt) that the House had not had time to study the Report of the Joint Committee; that as the matter affected a large body of most respectable gentlemen throughout the country, it would only be just and fair that the further consideration of the question should be adjourned. His opinion, under the circumstances, was that it would be unwise to proceed further at present. He suggested, therefore, that both the Resolutions and the Amendment should be withdrawn, and the whole subject postponed till next Session. No practical effect would be gained by proceeding with the discussion further.

Mr. DODSON said, he fully concurred in the postponement of the matter until next Session. He wished, however, to point out that the Committee had not shown any desire to create a monopoly in those who became Parliamentary Agents, but to throw open the Profession to all who could pass a certain examination, whether they were admitted to practice as solicitors or not.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, he had read the evidence taken before the Committee and was prepared to discuss the subject, but would not attempt to do so in the face of the evident wish of the House that the discussion should be postponed to another Session. He quite concurred in that wish, and did not desire to express a decided opinion for or against the Report of the Committee without further consideration. But he found great fault with the Committee, influential as it was, in one respect. They examined six witnesses, one represented the Incorporated Law Society, one spoke on behalf of the Parliamentary Agents Society, and the other four were officers of the two Houses of Parliament. But not one single witness was examined on behalf of the public, who were just as much interested in the matter as the agents and lawyers. Nothing would have been easier than to have called as witnesses persons connected with some of those great Companies who were annually promoting Private Bills and whose opinion ought to have been ascertained upon the satisfactory or unsatisfactory state of Parliamentary Agency at present. He trusted that this would not be lost sight of and that some information as to the feeling of the public would be before the House when they were called upon to decide this question. It was one of very considerable importance, and he would only add that the officers of the House of Lords differed in their evidence from the officers of the House of Commons, and that whereas the Chairman of Ways and Means had stated one object to be the attainment of uniformity of practice between the two Houses, they had commenced by anything but uniformity of action, the House of Lords having adopted 19 Resolutions very different from the four much milder Resolutions proposed that day by the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means.

MR. CHARLEY suggested that the new rules should be framed during the Recess and laid on the Table for consideration before the matter came on for discussion next Session.

DR. KENEALY said, there was a growing feeling in the country that some means should be adopted for reducing the present extravagant cost of Private Bill legislation. It was a scandal that several thousand pounds should be required for the purpose of passing a private Bill.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he was quite ready, if the House so wished, to withdraw his Amendment, in order that the Resolution might be disposed of in some other way.

MR. ANDERSON said, he also had an Amendment on the Paper, the sole object of which was to protest against what he considered to be an injustice. Anybody could become a Parliamentary Agent if properly recommended, except a Scotch law agent. Against that distinction he protested, and thought that his Amendment, which was in the following terms :—

> "To add to the 4th resolution the words 'and that any rule under which it may be proposed to exempt any legal practitioner from examination for the position of Parliamentary Agent shall include, in addition to "writers to the signet," "enrolled law agents" so as to embrace the legal practitioners of Scotland,'"

should have the consideration which it deserved before the matter came before the House next Session.

MR. RAIKES said, he would offer no opposition to the course proposed by his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department, but withdraw his Motion on this occasion. He would consider the proposition of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) before the matter came on again for discussion.

MR. M'LAREN pointed out that the description "law agents" had been substituted for that of solicitors through the instrumentality of Lord Advocate Young, in 1873, and remarked that, unless the suggestion of the hon. Member for Glasgow was adopted, a great injustice would be done.

MR. CALLAN complained of the enormous amount of Parliamentary fees.

MR. RODWELL believed that the best mode of reducing the expenses of private legislation was to employ well-qualified, competent, and honest Agents.

Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

(*Mr. Richard Smyth, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Dease, Mr. Thomas Dickson, Mr. Redmond.*)

[BILL 194.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Richard Smyth.*)

MR. M. BROOKS, in rising to move as an Amendment, "That this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee," said, his belief was, that if the Bill were passed, its effect would be to cause such social changes in Ireland that great contentions must arise. Endeavours had been made to obtain some delay from the promoters of the Bill, in order to consider it, and also the Amendments about to be proposed by the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland, but the slightest concession could not be obtained. They had inscribed "No surrender" on their banner. They insisted that from East to West, from North to South throughout Ireland the public-houses should be closed from Saturday night till Monday morning.

He (Mr. Brooks) and his friends, who constituted a large proportion of the people of Ireland, firmly maintained that they were taken by surprise by the promoters of the Bill, many of whom no doubt were well-meaning men, and they accordingly claimed a little delay, but it was not accorded them. Under these circumstances, he (Mr. Brooks) thought he was justified in calling on the English House of Commons to give time to consider whether they would pass a law to prevent the people of Ireland from obtaining moderate refreshments on Sunday. There were from 50,000 to 100,000 persons in Dublin who were in the habit of taking a moderate amount of refreshment on Sundays. They represented a class who had no libraries or reading-rooms to go to, and the public-houses were their only places of public and social resort. Were they to be deprived of the only means at their disposal of meeting their companions in friendly intercourse? He believed that the opinion of the working men of Ireland had not been fairly obtained or put before Parliament. It had been represented that if this Bill became law strife and contention would cease, and English Members had supported it for this reason. The Bill, he would remind the House, was promoted principally by the Sunday Closing Association, which was only a part of a vast organization which had for its objects the total extinction of the liquor traffic and the passing of the Permissive Bill, but if it became law a terrific agitation would prevail throughout the country, and he desired to spare the country from such an agitation. He could not understand the motives of those gentlemen who, having cellars of their own, would close the door of the public-house against the working man in search of moderate refreshment. It was urged that there had been no agitation against the Bill by respectable working men. The reason was obvious; respectable working men thought agitation on such a subject unnecessary. It was quite true that an agitation on the question was not new in Ireland, but the police authorities and the Government had always discountenanced it, and had assured the people that the prospect of carrying such a measure was hopeless. By that means the working classes of Ireland had been lulled into a feeling of false security, and upon this ground he hoped a better opportunity would be afforded for eliciting the opinions of those whom that Bill would affect. The noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition objected to the Bill, and expressed his opinion that it would not be tolerated by respectable working men. In Ireland there were 22 distinct trade societies, of which he had a list in his hand, who were opposed to the Bill, and he thought they were better judges of the wants and wishes of the working classes than the promoters of the Bill. He hoped this was sufficient to show that the operatives in Ireland were not favourable to the Bill. Not a single Petition had come from any of those organized societies in favour of the Bill. There was a large number of Sunday visitors to public-houses who would be inconvenienced by this Bill if it became law. He had been informed that in one house there were 9,000 visitors who spent about 2*d.* each. He trusted that for the sake of peace and good order the Bill would not be pressed on too hastily, and that while Parliament would adopt any reasonable proposal for improving the morality of the people, it would not consent unduly to restrict the liberties and freedom of the working and other classes affected by this Bill. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Amendment.

Mr. STACPOOLE, in seconding the Amendment, said, as an Irish Member who had for many years devoted his attention to the subject before the House, he wished to explain the reasons why he thought the sort of class legislation proposed in the Bill of the hon. Member for Londonderry should not be persevered with, especially at the extreme end of the Session, when so many matters of public business were still in an unfinished state. He was a Member of the Select Committee, which in the year 1868 sat to take evidence on a Sunday Closing Bill brought in by the hon. and gallant Member for Longford (Major O'Reilly), which Bill was of a far less stringent character than the measure now before the House. That Committee included amongst its Members the then Chief Secretary for Ireland, the late Earl of Mayo, and the present Lord Carlingford, who had since filled the office of Chief Secretary. It included also Lord Emly and Mr. Pim, the late Member for Dublin, and these four Gentlemen might be taken as fairly representing large sections of Irish opinion. The result of the inquiry and of the deliberations of that Committee was that the Bill was materially altered by the Committee, and the alterations they recommended had since been embodied in legislation, and were now the law in Ireland. With one or two exceptions he attended every sitting of that Committee, and he was able to state to the House the nature of the evidence, which convinced them that the closing of the public-houses in Ireland on Sunday would be undesirable and inexpedient. He thought the fact that a Select Committee had already considered the subject, and that its recommendations had been embodied in legislation, was the strongest possible argument against the attempt to rush this Bill through Parliament at the fag-end of the Session. He might say that the advocates of Sunday closing in Ireland made quite as strong a case before that Committee as they had ever been able to make in that House. Why, then, did the Committee reject their conclusions? Because they were convinced, by independent and impartial testimony, that the proposed restrictions would work badly in Ireland; and, secondly, because they had ample evidence that these restrictions would be regarded by the working population as hostile and insulting to them. He should now lay before the House a few of the most material points of evidence on each of those heads, quoting from the Report of the Select Committee of 1868. Mr. Francis Lyons, a merchant, and at that time the Mayor of Cork, stated that, in his opinion, it would be utterly impossible to stop the sale of intoxicating drinks altogether in Cork; that the middle class would feel the total closing of public-houses on Sunday a great hardship; and that such a measure would lead to a worse state of affairs than then existed, by the creation of shebeen houses to a very large extent. Mr. Thomas Hamilton, resident magistrate of the City of Cork, gave somewhat similar testimony as to the hardship upon the people of the total closing of public-houses on Sunday, but at the same time recommended that the hours for keeping them open should be limited. He should next refer to the evidence of Mr. Porter, a gentleman of great ability and experience, who had held the office of police magistrate in Dublin for over 20 years. Mr. Porter expressed a strong opinion against the principle of restriction in the liquor traffic. He believed that if the public-houses were closed in the extensive division he had to deal with in Dublin, there would not be less intoxication or less cases before the magistrates on Monday morning. He thought that if the public-houses were shut completely there would be an enormous amount of illicit traffic carried on which no police could detect or stop. He also stated that within his memory there had been a great improvement in the habits of the people, and he ascribed their greater sobriety to the progress of civilization and self-respect. Mr. Porter relied more on moral suasion and religious influence to promote temperance among the people than to the operation of any Act of Parliament, and considered that proper surveillance of public-houses, and making the owners responsible for their management, would be far more effectual than any restrictions on the hours of opening. The next witness whose testimony he should cite was the Very Reverend Canon M'Cabe, a distinguished Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, who had had a very large experience of parochial duty in Dublin. At the time of his examination before the Committee he was parish priest of Kingstown, but he had previously been connected with other parishes both in the City and suburbs of Dublin. Canon M'Cabe stated that drunkenness had decreased in the last 20 years, which he attributed to the better instruction of the people both in religion and in secular knowledge. The working classes also were better off than formerly, and he thought drunkenness among them would decrease as their comforts increased. Having considered the question he would not, from his experience of Dublin and Kingstown, recommend the total closing of public-houses on Sunday. He had reason to know that there was a very considerable amount of drinking on the Sunday morning in the City of Dublin during the prohibited hours, arising from the illicit sale of drink. The result of Canon M'Cabe's evidence was that the restrictions then in force did not prevent drinking on Sundays, and that, judging from his experience, the Bill then before the Committee would not effect that object. Mr. John Lewis O'Farrall, who for many years held the important office of Chief Commissioner of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, was also examined before the Committee. Mr. O'Farrall had been requested by Lord Mayo to report on the Bill; and in his Report he said—

> "With regard to the Bill now before Parliament for reducing the hours during which public-houses may keep open on Sunday, the Commissioners fear that the measure, as now framed, would not be effecting the object it has in view."

They were of opinion that the effect of such a measure in Dublin would be to aggravate the evil of Sunday traffic, and lead to a great amount of illicit drinking. Such was the evidence given before the Select Committee of 1868 by the most competent and unimpeachable witnesses as to the improbability of anything like total Sunday closing working well in Ireland. He had not referred to the evidence of any of the witnesses who might be disposed to speak either for the working classes or for the licensed victuallers. Upon that evidence the Select Committee came unanimously to the conclusion in favour of the hours for opening public-houses in Ireland which were now established by law. He would only say in conclusion, while thanking the House for its very great indulgence on that occasion—an indulgence which during the long period he had had the honour of a seat in that House he had rarely trespassed on at any great length—that he protested against the Bill as grossly unfair to the people of Ireland, and that he particularly objected to the attempt to hurry it through the House at that late period of the Session, to the detriment of Public Business, and to the great inconvenience of the Members of that House.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee," —(*Mr. Maurice Brooks,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. ASSHETON said, he should address himself to one aspect only of this question—namely, that of the *bonâ fide* traveller. He believed it was that difficulty which would ultimately upset the practical working of this measure if it became law in it present form. He did not believe that one in ten of the persons who had signed Petitions in favour of the Sunday Closing Bill had any idea that it would leave the public-house open to everyone except those who lived within a certain distance of it—that there would be no difficulty in a man getting as much drink as he liked if he only walked a distance of three miles to get it. That was a nuisance from which people in the country districts of England suffered at present; and no doubt if this Bill became law the people of Ireland would suffer likewise. He knew that in Lancashire it was the practice in the large towns to form what were called Omnibus Clubs, to enable their members to go into the country in order to drink at the public-houses outside the three-mile district, which they were enabled to do by calling themselves *bonâ fide* travellers, the result being that the Sundays were turned into days of drunkenness and debauchery. While the Bill reserved the rights of the *bonâ fide* traveller, it appeared to him that they were overlooking the rights of those whom he should call the *bonâ fide* inhabitants. He meant the men who were in the habit of going to public-houses near their homes, either for the purpose of drinking in moderation, or of carrying away drink to be consumed in their own homes. He could not say that drinking was in itself wrong. If they could, it would be a reason for closing the public-houses every day in the week. They must abandon that argument so long as they continued to licence public-houses. If they passed the Bill, the result would be that the unfortunate *bonâ fide* inhabitant would have to go without his glass of beer on Sunday, and his wife and family, who perhaps only tasted malt liquor at their meals on that day, would be obliged to forego that enjoyment, whereas the sham *bonâ fide* traveller would be able to drink as much as he pleased, and the result would be that that class of persons would be greatly increased. Numbers of people who were now in the habit of getting drunk at their own doors would simply go a little further off and get drunk there. The country villages in Ireland would, in point of fact, be subjected to the same nuisance as the Lancashire villages in the present day, of having the off-scourings of the towns poured down upon them on the Sunday. He felt most strongly that if they passed the Bill in its present shape they would sacrifice the interests of the *bonâ fide* inhabitants, while preserving those of the *bonâ fide* traveller, who was a *bonâ fide* humbug, and nothing else. If a real and genuine Sunday Closing Bill were introduced, closing public-houses absolutely to all, it would be well worthy of their grave consideration, but he looked upon the Bill as it stood as a sham and a snare, and therefore he should vote against it.

Dr. KENEALY said, he supported the Bill on a plain and intelligible ground—because he believed it was the almost unanimous desire of the Irish people that it should become law. He thought the House would commit a great error, if it did not give effect to the wishes of the people in this matter. One of the causes of the discontent of Ireland was that that House did not give effect to the wishes of the Irish people, and they would take a powerful argument out of the mouths of the disaffected persons in Ireland if, in this instance, they gave effect to what was the almost universal desire of the people of that country. There was another strong reason why he supported this Bill—namely, that it had the support of nearly all the Scotch Members in that House. Scotland had long had experience of the benefits of Sunday closing, and the Scotch Members, to their honour, had almost unanimously united with their Irish brethren in demanding that the law which had so much benefited their own country should be extended to their fellow-countrymen in Ireland. He did not often care to interfere in Irish questions, because he thought the Irish Members were best qualified to pronounce an opinion on those subjects, and whenever he had heard an Irish question discussed in that House, he had found it discussed with a knowledge, a temper, and a patriotism that reminded him of the glorious days of their ancient Parliament. The voice of the majority of the Irish Members, representing no doubt the majority of the people was in favour of this measure, and he asked why should not the Irish people be allowed to have their own way in a matter of this kind, on which they had set their hearts? He had heard nothing from the hon. Members who opposed the Bill but a repetition of the arguments which had been addressed to the House on previous occasions. It must be remembered, however, that the House of Commons had by a large and unusual majority passed a Resolution in favour of the Bill, and he thought they would be stultifying themselves if they did not now adhere to that Resolution, the passing of which he believed gave the greatest possible satisfaction to the people of Ireland. One hon. Member said that this Bill would have the effect of encouraging drinking on the sly; but if they were to have drinking on the Sundays he certainly should prefer drunkenness on the sly to drunkenness on the open. Another argument used was that such of the Irish people as wanted to get drunk would be able to gratify that propensity on Sunday by only walking a distance of three miles. For his part he had no sympathy with the man who had no command over his passions, and he would give him no facility for indulging them, but would compel him to walk the three miles if he wanted to drink on Sunday. If drunkenness and debauchery were prevalent on Sundays in the manufacturing districts of England it was because there was no Sunday Closing Bill in England. The beneficial results of such a measure were seen in Scotland, which presented a spectacle of the most sublime character that could be conceived. Piety, devotion, religion, and everything that could adorn and beautify human nature were exhibited in that ancient nation, because of the devotional sentiment that had grown up in that country in consequence of the restrictions on Sunday drinking which had existed since the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act. It had been said that this Bill, if passed, would give rise to many evils, but it was not true statesmanship to legislate on prophecies of that kind. When the evils arose Parliament could deal with them, but they ought not, on account of these prophecies, to refuse to pass a measure which was demanded by the people of Ireland, and which in Scotland had produced such a salutary effect.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he should not have addressed the House on the question had not the Bill assumed a new aspect in consequence of the Amendments placed on the Paper by the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland. If the Government persevered with those Amendments, they would be embodied in the Bill; and regarding the measure from that point of view, he would venture to make a few observations upon it. Everyone was in favour of having Ireland made a temperate nation, but they had to consider how far temperance would be promoted by this measure. He had had considerable experience of three Provinces of Ireland for many years, and his belief was, that if there had been gross intemperance existing in any parts of Ireland, it was in the large cities, and not in the agricultural districts. Yet, according to the Bill, if amended as the Government proposed, it was not in the cities, but in the country districts of Ireland that legislation was required to check the intemperance of the people. His experience of three counties—Tipperary, and the King's and the Queen's Counties—did not allow him to form that opinion, more especially since the hours for the sale of liquor in the small towns of Ireland had been restricted. He did not think anyone would venture to assert that drinking in the sense of extreme intemperance existed in any one of the three counties he had named. No doubt, there were occasions on which the people did indulge in intemperance, but they were comparatively rare. For weeks there was no more temperate member of society than the small agriculturist in Ireland. His mode of living was frugal, and the use of alcoholic stimulants by him was the exception and not the rule. When, however, his business brought him to fairs and markets, he was sometimes led into intemperance by the habit which prevailed of concluding every bargain with a drink; indeed, it would be idle to compare the amount of drinking which took place in agricultural districts in Ireland on Sundays to the drinking at the fairs and markets in the same neighbourhoods. But if that were so and if legislation were necessary, it was the duty of that House to direct its legislation to where there was an admitted evil, and not to introduce legislation where the evil was not admitted to exist. There were two classes of persons who supported the Bill. One consisted of men who advocated the measure with that energy and purpose which always sprung from deep conviction. They believed that drinking in Ireland was the curse of the country, and that the suppression of the sale of all kinds of alcoholic stimulants was necessary for the welfare of the people. There was another class who supported this Bill from a deep conviction that the keeping of the Sabbath in the Scotch fashion—if he might use the expression—was a matter which would tend to the eternal welfare of their countrymen, and at the same time would be attended with great social advantages. He thought he was safe in stating that the agitation in favour of this Bill had been promoted by gentlemen who were actuated by the motives he had mentioned, and who regarded this Bill but as a step in the right direction. Now, everyone acquainted with Ireland could readily imagine how easy it was for able and energetic men, such as he had described, to obtain signatures to Petitions in favour of this measure. Men were often induced by their friends to sign Petitions on matters in which, though their friends were, they themselves did not feel deeply interested. He believed there were several questions in Ireland which many hon. Members of that House might regard as extremely dangerous, but in which large numbers of the Irish people felt great interest, and they would laugh at the idea of putting the Sunday Closing Bill before those questions. The number of Petitions in favour of the Bill was not therefore to be regarded as a conclusive proof of the existence of any deep feeling on the part of the people, though he was not prepared to deny that there was a strong feeling amongst a numerous class in its favour. This question had been discussed in that House from a point of view in which he declined to consider it. It had been said this was a question between the vintner on the one side and the advocates of Sabbatarianism and teetotalism on the other. There was, however, a class of people in Ireland that belonged to neither of these sections. These were the ordinary inhabitants of the country, who did not hold strict views on the subject of Sabbath observance, and who had no trade interests in the sale of alcohol. He felt that on this question as on many others a "Left Centre" policy had best be adopted. When they were considering a question of this magnitude the opinions and interests of these people should be considered. The only interest they ought to consider was not that of the vintner, but of the public; and if he understood that interest, it would be promoted not by the total closing of the public-houses on a Sunday, but by the early closing of those houses on Saturday nights. That was the course he would suggest. It was in the large towns that the drinking took place, but the object of the Government seemed to be to continue intemperance in the large towns, the only places which in fact needed to be legislated for. No doubt, many of the most respectable inhabitants of the counties, especially members of the Church of Ireland, and of other Protestant denominations, were in favour of Sunday closing, and no one more thoroughly acknowledged than he did the absolute necessity of respecting the religious feelings of all classes of the community, but at the same time he did not think it was necessary to a well-spent Sabbath that they should have so stringent a measure passed. Would any hon. Member assert that the Irish people were anxious to have a "Scotch" Sabbath forced upon their country? He would not say it would lead to a revolution; but of this he was sure, that it would give rise to an enormous amount of dissatisfaction, and to that rowdyism which some people said it was the object of the Bill to repress. He believed that the populace had not been considered on this question. Although they had had inquiries by Committees and Commissions, he believed there was less intemperance in Ireland of late than in the time past. He was free to confess, however, that the proper course to adopt would be to close the public-houses at, say, 8 o'clock on Saturday evening, as the great evil which existed was that their remaining open after that hour afforded undue facilities for the spending of the wages of the working classes. He protested against the large towns being excluded from the operation of the Bill, if it were to pass, as they were the only places the drinking in which would at all justify the proposing of such a measure as the present. He had not taken any part in those discussions heretofore, and he would not have taken any part then, if the Bill remained as it had been originally introduced; but he would be no party to the imputation which was sought to be cast upon the agricultural districts by this amended Bill, that they required this special legislation.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD agreed with the hon. Baronet who had just sat down (Sir Patrick O'Brien) that the great evil which existed was the late hours to which the public-houses remained open on Saturday nights. An Irishman was generous at all times, but he was additionally generous when he had taken a little drink, and with his week's earnings in his pocket he was likely not only to drink himself, but to treat those whom he met at the public-house, and thus the money which ought to be handed to his wife he would very likely spend upon others. Then, having drunk on Saturday night, it was probable he would drink also on Sunday, and be unable to go to his work on Monday morning. It was true that in many places where drink was retailed, eatables and clothing were also sold, but no inconvenience would arise from that fact, as people would be led to purchase what they required on the morning of Saturday, if the evening hours were restricted. What he should like to see was an early closing on Saturday afternoons or evenings, and a restriction of the hours of remaining open on Sundays to, say, five hours. One great reason why he voted against the entire closing on Sundays was, that he believed it would not attain its avowed object of putting a stop to drinking in Ireland. Let them punish the drunkard more, but not those who had but one day in the week for recreation and amusement, and who did not even think of getting drunk. These were, however, the people they would punish if they passed the Bill.

MR. SWANSTON said, that he had not heretofore expressed any opinion on the Bill before the House, but in consequence of its altered position in consequence of the probable adoption of the proposals made by the Government with the view of enabling the inhabitants of the large towns in Ireland to have the opportunity of obtaining refreshment on Sundays, while the residents of the boroughs in that country whose numbers were not equal to those in the large towns would be deprived of the opportunity of having such refreshment on that day, he felt, as a Member of an Irish borough, that he ought to express the feeling which he entertained, that the proposal of the Government in this respect was most objectionable and unfair. And this, he believed, was the view entertained on this branch of the subject by the Representatives of the other boroughs of Ireland. They felt that before the Government had come to the conclusion that the inhabitants of Irish boroughs should thus be deprived of the means of obtaining refreshment in public-houses on the Sunday the opinions of those inhabitants ought to have been taken on the subject. This course had been adopted by the Government in respect to the ratepayers of the large towns in Ireland, and a similar course ought to have been pursued in respect to the ratepayers of the boroughs. By the clauses proposed by the Government the city of Cork, which had a population of 100,000 persons, had been excluded from the operation of the Bill, while the borough of Bandon, which he had the honour to represent, and the other boroughs in the county of Cork, which contained, in the aggregate, 60,000 inhabitants, and which were situated in large and important agricultural districts, were to be deprived of the privilege conceded to the citizens of the city of Cork in respect to refreshment on a Sunday, and this course was adopted by the Government without means having been taken to learn what were the views of the ratepayers and inhabitants of those boroughs. As he had stated previously, he considered this to be a great injustice, and he thought an opportunity ought to be afforded to the inhabitants of the towns and boroughs in Ireland, each of which contained a less population than 10,000 persons, to express their opinion on the subject. This might be done by postponing the further progress of the Bill until next Session—the opportunity being thus afforded of learning in the meantime what that opinion was. When this Bill was before the House on a former occasion, he had taken no part in respect to it. He had walked out of the House without voting upon it, and he would adopt the same course that day, in the hope that when the measure was brought forward next Session the Government would have taken means to ascertain the opinion of the inhabitants of the boroughs that were to be affected by the measure.

Mr. MARTEN said, it was alleged that the Bill was demanded by the almost unanimous feeling of the people of Ireland, but they must draw a distinction between those who would and those who would not be affected by the measure. Those who would not be affected by the Bill were the higher classes, who remained in their houses or had recourse to their clubs, where they could obtain all they required; while those who would be affected by its operation would be the poorer classes, who had no other place to resort to on the Sunday but the public-house to obtain the refreshment they required. A reference to this point naturally suggested what occurred in London in 1855, when the present Lord Ebury, then Lord Robert Grosvenor, brought in his Bill against Sunday trading in London. At first, the effect of that Bill was not understood by the people generally; but after the second reading the people saw what would be its effect, and then commenced scenes of rioting in Hyde Park which lasted several Sundays, and showed what the feeling of the people was in reference to a measure affecting their interests. At first the measure was supposed to have had the sanction of the public, and the House of Commons agreed to the second reading without the slightest opposition. What subsequently took place—namely, the rejection of the Bill, proved that the Legislature was mistaken, and this showed how easy it was for Parliament to be misled for a time as to the tendency of public opinion. This fact proved how careful they ought to be before legislating on a popular subject like that under consideration, to see that the measure was one that would be acceptable to those who were to be affected by it. This measure, if passed, would injure the honest householder and the working man by depriving them of their dinner beer on a Sunday, and would in this way be a great hardship and injustice to that class of the community; while it would, on the other hand, encourage sham *bonâ fide* travelling, as English legislation had done when it led to the running of *bonâ fide* traveller's omnibuses on the Sunday and such like expedients, by which intemperance was created rather than lessened, and which, by enabling men to go a short distance from town to get that drink which they could not obtain in their own neighbourhood, increased the evils of Sunday drinking by leading to the discomfort of the wives and families of the persons who took advantage of this sham *bonâ fide* traveller privilege. But it had been said that the curse of Ireland was the intemperance of the people owing to the use of ardent spirits, which led, it was said, to violence and crime. But the statistics of Ireland showed that there was a great diminution of intemperance and crime in Ireland; and, if that were so, would it not be wise to let well alone? He thought he was safe in saying that a great change for the better was going on in Ireland, and this did not want to be stimulated by a measure of this kind. He judged of this from the fact that there was a large increase in the amounts deposited by the people in the savings banks, and that this increase of saving was accompanied by a considerable decrease of intemperance. He had come down to the House unprovided with any elaborate details, but all the authorities confirmed this—that any measure which would shut up the public-houses altogether would be likely to do more harm than good. He would, however, with the permission of the House, refer to what had been said during the late Assizes in Ireland by one of Her Majesty's Judges. He told the Grand Jury that he had no confidence in a measure of this kind proving satisfactory to the country, or that it was possible to make the people sober by statute; that if they wished to achieve that object they could only do it by educating the people, by improving the dwellings of the poor, and by the continued efforts of the clergy of all denominations. That was the testimony of a man well qualified to judge of what might be the result of legislation such as this. He would quote another piece of evidence, and that the evidence of one equally competent to form a correct judgment on the question. Mr. Payne, Lord Bantry's agent, speaking of the district in which he lived, told them that the population of it was of three classes—a town population, a rural one, and one connected with the sea. They numbered in all 30,000 people, and during the last year 311 of them had been prosecuted for drunkenness, which was at the rate for one year of one man out of every 100. With these figures before him he did not see how drunkenness could be charged against the Irish people as a national sin, or that there was any reason for what he could not but call class legislation. He had also the expression of public opinion of great weight in the newspapers of the country, warning them that if this Bill should pass it would not have the effects expected from it. He would now refer to what had been said about the satisfactory working of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act in Scotland. Now, all the testimony which came to him on that question went to show that, although the closing of public-houses had led to an improvement in the outer show of decorum, Sunday drinking being, by its means, concealed to a great extent from public view, yet the quantity of alcoholic drink now consumed was greater than it had been before the passing of the Act to which he had just referred. But, supposing it to be satisfactory, then he would say the habits of the Scotch people were different from those of the English and the Irish. The Presbyterian Church required the strict observance of the Sabbath, and on that day put a restraint upon everything which might look like cheerfulness and jollity. It would, then, be altogether illogical to endeavour to apply to the case of Ireland, where the people had a different mode of observing the day, a measure which might suit the more Calvinistic habits of the Scotch. They could not, in a matter of this kind, reason from the case of Scotland to the case of Ireland. Thanking the House for the patience with which it had listened to his observations, he would conclude by saying that while they were all agreed in the common object of promoting sobriety, they were all equally agreed not to adopt even for that object any measures of a tyrannical character, or that pressed upon the natural liberty of their fellow-men.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he would not have addressed the House had it not been for the speech which the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Marten) had just made in regard to Scotland. The hon. and learned Member stated that he had made particular inquiries with regard to Scotland, and said he was ready to supply the House with important facts; but after listening to him attentively he (Mr. M'Laren) had been unable to find anything of the kind. No doubt there was a great deal of assertion which might help to spin out the discussion and talk out the Bill, but it did not at all help the argument. In talking about the Sabbatarians of Scotland and the intemperance of the people, a little more acquaintance with Scotland would prove to the hon. and learned Member that his facts did not exist to anything like the degree which he imagined to be the case. Even if it were true, his remarks would apply not to the Presbyterian people alone, because there was a large Irish population in Scotland, and surely they would rebel against the state of things indicated if such were the case. The Census Returns of 1871 showed that the Irish persons resident in Glasgow alone—persons born in Ireland, irrespective of children born in Glasgow —numbered 75,000, constituting a population larger than that of the city of Cork. Did they complain? Were they on the eve of rebellion? For all he knew, they were as content with the Sunday closing law as the rest of the population. They suffered all the disadvantages of other people, and yet he never heard anything about their dissatisfaction. In the city he represented (Edinburgh) there were about 9,000 persons born in Ireland, apart from children born in Scotland, and he never heard of any Irish man or woman complaining in any manner about the closing of public-houses on Sundays. A good many of them in the lower quarters of the town had licences to sell spirits, either public-house licences or grocers' licences, but he believed they were just as amenable to the law as any other class, and as well disposed to have the Sunday's rest. If they were to poll the licensed victuallers in the city he represented, and ask them whether they would be opened or closed on Sundays, they would say—"By no means have public-houses open on Sundays." Before the Scotch Act passed he had been chief magistrate of the city, and at that time went among the publicans in the low neighbourhoods to entreat them to close their houses on Sundays. He got 145 to shut up their houses voluntarily on Sundays, but in time the numbers fell off. They said if they could get a general law for the purpose they would be delighted, but that when they shut their houses and their neighbours kept open, the neighbours got not only the Sunday trade but the trade of the whole of the week, because the one class were thought to be obliging to their customers and the others disobliging. The hon. and learned Member had given no facts. He said there was as much liquor drunk in Scotland on Sunday as formerly, or perhaps more. If that were the case, men would appear drunk in the streets. When men got drink they liked to go about in their tipsy state and see what was going on. The drink overpowered them when they got into the open air, and they were taken up by the police. What did the police statistics show? The police statistics were published every year, and what was the state of matters for the last 23 years since the Forbes-Mackenzie Act was passed? The last yearly publication was issued a few days ago. It was made up by the police and at the expense of the magistrates of Edinburgh, and from these Returns he could give the hon. and learned Gentleman some facts which it would be well for him to ponder; and if he was at a loss for facts in another discussion, these would be found accurate, and very useful. The Returns were made up in different tables. One showed the number of persons who were found drunk and incapable in the streets during the last 24 years, and he would be happy, after he had done with it, to give the hon. and learned Member his copy of the publication because he could get another. First, he would contrast the Returns now with those 24 years ago, on the subject of drunkenness, and let him remind the House that the city had not the same population then as now, but had enormously increased—more than one-fourth —and therefore, if the Act had produced no effect for good or evil, the cases of drunkenness ought to be one-fourth more in number than they were at the commencement of this table. The number of persons taken up by the police between 8 o'clock on Sunday morning and 8 o'clock on Monday in the year before the passing of the Act was 403, and if the number had increased with the population, it would now be 100 more. Now, what were the numbers last year? Forty-six in place of 403. It might be said that those who kept themselves sober on Sundays went to drink their fill on the Mondays. The table for Mondays showed that the cases 24 years ago were 776, and by increase of popuation should now be 1,000. The number now was 268, in place of 1,000. But it might be said that if they did not go to excess on Sunday or Monday, they would give way on Saturday, and would drink an extraordinary quantity then. Having looked up the numbers in the police Returns, he found the number of cases on Saturdays 24 years ago was 1,200, and should now have been 1,500. The number now was 517. Now, he thought the hon. and learned Gentleman, if he pondered over these things, would be unable to say there was more drunkenness in Scotland since the Act was passed. He could assure him, and he could assure the House, that what was called the Sabbatarian party in Scotland—men who professed to be exceedingly strict in their observance of the Sabbath—did not hold this question in their hands exclusively. He believed most of the anti-Sabbatarian people were just as willing to adopt the closing of public-houses as the Sabbatarian people. He entreated the House to pass the Bill, and if they did so he believed they would confer the greatest good on Ireland that ever had been conferred.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he would treat the Bill as if the Amendments of the Chief Secretary for Ireland formed a portion of it, for they all knew that unless those Amendments were accepted, the Bill would not be carried into law at all. If they did accept those Amendments, then he would say the Bill would not be satisfactory to anyone. A meeting which had been just held at Belfast under the presidency of the Mayor of that town to consider the matter, expressed its surprise and regret at the nature of those Amendments and declared that no settlement of this question would be satisfactory which altered the principle of this Bill. He was quite aware of the pains which had been taken by the advocates of the measure to collect Petitions in favour of it, and he quite admitted that they showed by statistics that it might lead to outward decorum and good order, but he denied that they represented what were the feelings of the people who were the most interested in the matter. The persons who signed those Petitions were such zealous friends of decorum and good order that they would even close the public-houses altogether, and he did not know if he would object to that, if it were only to see how far the country would stand it. He was ready to admit that the Forbes-Mackenzie Act was working on the side of decorum, but the statistics did not carry the case beyond that. He found that whereas in Ireland the annual consumption of alcoholic drink, or its equivalent —that was to say, the consumption of all intoxicating beverages, foreign spirits, wines and brewers' drinks, calculated on the equivalent of strength to the gallon of proof spirits—was three gallons per head, it was in Scotland four and a-half gallons per head; these were the proportions of the relative consumption, notwithstanding all the reports they had received of the benefits which Scotland had derived from the closing of public-houses on Sunday. In other words, the Scotch, notwithstanding all their Sabbatarian pretensions and the rigid regulations in force drank 50 per cent more than the Irish did. That, he thought, satisfactorily disposed of the argument taken from the working of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act. [Mr. M'Laren: No, no!] He could not see how the hon. Gentleman could get over the fact that the inhabitants of Scotland, including the 70,000 Irish in Glasgow, drank the equivalent of four and a-half gallons of proof spirit per head, whereas the inhabitants of Ireland drank only three gallons. These statistics might be erroneous, but they were based on those which had been obtained from the Government by the hon. Member for Dumbarton (Mr. Orr Ewing) for quite a different object—namely, to show what Scotland more than Ireland paid to the Imperial Exchequer.

Mr. M'LAREN said, it was quite a mistake.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, the figures had been already used without challenge in another debate in this House. He had taken them from the Parliamentary Report, and if they were erroneous, he was not accountable.

Mr. M'LAREN said, there were two sets of Returns, and those which the hon. Member referred to were altogether wrong. They were Returns showing how many gallons of spirits were distilled in Scotland, and not how many were consumed. The hon. Member had given the number of gallons distilled in Scotland, but he had not taken into account that a large portion went to England.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he might make the same assertion with respect to the Irish Return; in reality the figures represented the quantities respectively entered for home consumption, but, perhaps, the hon. Member for Edinburgh wished to convey the idea that the whiskey entered for home consumption in Scotland was conveyed in bond across the border and consumed, but he apprehended this also occurred to some extent in the case of Irish spirits, and he would therefore say that while the relative consumption of proof spirit in Scotland and in Ireland was such as he had just mentioned, it in England amounted to seven gallons per head. If, then, the question whether the House should pass this Bill rested merely upon the question of the extent of consumption, he did not see what reason they could have for closing the public-houses in Ireland. It might be a good thing to close public-houses in Ireland altogether on Sunday, because that might serve as an indication of what the Irish people would stand in that direction. He held, however, that this was not a Bill to close the public-houses, but one to open them for that ubiquitous gentleman the *bonâ fide* traveller. He could not see on what principle it was proposed on Sunday to entirely close the public-houses in towns under 10,000 inhabitants, while they were to be allowed to keep open for certain hours on that day in towns whose population exceeded that number. There would not be any use in passing this Bill, for, as he gathered from the Belfast meeting, the moment it passed the agitation in respect to it would begin again. If it were a measure that was calculated to finally settle the question he might vote for it. He would not have spoken had it not been that he wished to dispel the utter delusion that sobriety had been promoted in Scotland by the operation of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act. Whatever might be the result of this Motion he should not vote one way or the other, but leave it to the Government to get rid of the important responsibility which they had undertaken when the Chief Secretary for Ireland undertook to introduce his Amendments into the Bill.

SIR WALTER BARTTELOT said, he had been in the hope that some arrangement might have been made by which a Bill for Sunday closing in Ireland could have been carried that year; but he was sorry to say that he had not heard a single Member speak a word in favour of the Amendments placed upon the Paper by the Government, or declare that they would in the slightest respect improve the measure. He had always consistently opposed the Bill, because he regarded it as belonging to that class of measures which, as an interference with personal liberty, were objectionable. At the same time, he admitted that there was a strong feeling in favour of the Bill, and when the Resolution of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. R. Smyth) was before the House, he did say that, as that public feeling had been so strongly expressed in favour of it, the Government ought to take the matter in hand, and see if they could not bring forward a satisfactory measure. Looking to the Amendments of the right hon. Baronet he was bound to say they were not of that character which he expected from Her Majesty's Government, neither did he think they would effectually satisfy the demands of the Irish people in the matter. He quite agreed with the hon. Baronet the Member for King's County (Sir Patrick O'Brien) that the Bill would convey the impression that by restricting the hours only in the towns, and completely closing the public-houses in the country, the Government showed that it was their opinion that drunkenness prevailed more largely in the country than in the towns, or that there was an absence in the country of the organization that existed in the towns to whose pressure the Government had yielded. In his opinion, if the Bill was good for the country it was equally good for the towns, and no invidious distinction should be drawn between them. He had come to the conclusion that in the present state of feeling on the part of hon. Members on both sides of the House, and at that late period of the Session, it was impossible that the measure could become law that year, and therefore he should recommend Her Majesty's Government to advise the withdrawal of the Bill now, with the view of their considering the matter carefully during the Recess, and introducing a properly-framed measure on their own responsibility next Session; treating all localities alike with respect to the Sunday restrictions. He hoped his right hon. Friend, who had placed several Amendments on the Paper in reference to the Bill, whose important position in relation to Ireland gave him such ample opportunities of obtaining information, and who had already done much good service for that country, would see that the postponement of the measure at present would be more likely to promote the welfare of Ireland, and to lead to a reasonable settlement of the question, than could be hoped for at present.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, he was one of those who found it hard to approve the principle of the Bill, but as public opinion had not been opposed to it, in a preponderance, in his constituency, he had always abstained from recording a vote against its principle, resting satisfied with an expression of his views. He believed that the reality of the legislation had come on the people of Ireland by surprise, and he thought it desirable that it should be withdrawn for the present, in order that his constituents might have time for expressing their opinion on it by next Session. For his own part, he believed that the persons to be consulted on this question most carefully, were the masses whose personal liberty would be interfered with by the measure, not the upper and middle classes of society, not the priests, parsons, and householders, but the artizans, who had neither families nor homes. It was the absence of other amusement that drove these men into the public-houses on a Sunday, and if the public-houses were closed these men would have no other occupation on Sunday but to lounge at the corners of the streets. Such men were not in the habit of expressing their opinions in a constitutional manner, and that was one reason why so little opposition had been heard to the Bill. They had not petitioned in any great numbers—first, because, as he thought, they did not regard the proceedings of the agitation as anything more than a counterpart of the Permissive Bill agitation, and they thought the Bill too absurd to become law, believing it to have been brought forward by a few Dissenting ministers and agitators in support of a crotchet. When it was found, however, that it was seriously intended to pass such a measure these people would see that the time had arrived for them to speak, and they would probably manifest their opinion on the matter during the Recess. Such opposition as there had been to the Bill had been got up by the licensed victuallers, and in consequence of their indiscreet language with regard to the National Party in Ireland, the people had declined to take part in it. That, however, could not be taken to express their assent. He asked that some time should be given to the people, on whom the measure had, he believed, come by surprise, to consider some of the grave questions suggested by the measure. There were many such problems which would now, for the first time, be considered with the certainty of legislation affecting the people. There was the effect of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act in Scotland. The hon. Member for Fifeshire, in a speech made in that House, shewed that crime and intemperance had increased in Scotland, notwithstanding that Act. Then there was the question whether "Sunday closing" would not promote home drinking, which would involve, if it occurred, the spread of drinking among women, and bad example to children in their own homes. Then, there was the question whether illicit drinking would increase, and on that subject the police had given testimony unfavourable to the measure. Another question struck him forcibly. The effect of the measure would be to call the aid of the secular arm to help the Catholic Church in teaching morality to the people. That duty the Catholic Church had discharged admirably during centuries, when the secular arm was against and not with her. If her authorities determined to support the measure in its entirety that would be the first instance in which they had sought the assistance of that arm; but he would bow to their decision, because they had guided the people of Ireland with such safety that they were entitled to be obeyed on the subject. But for his part, most clergymen to whom he had spoken seemed to him to have supported the measure rather with a view of restricting the hours than procuring total closing. He did not, however, assume to speak on their behalf, or as their representative. But it would not be unreasonable to allow the great issue he had pointed out to be considered. He appealed to the great supporters of the movement, who were certain of valuable reforms, to sacrifice to prudence, to pause in their victorious course, and to allow the grave question of the expediency of total closing to be considered during the Recess. If they were right in their estimate of popular opinion, it would only delay their victory a few months. He approved of the Amendments of the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary, because they would give the large towns, where the problem was confessedly more difficult, to see the effect of the measure on the rest of the country. He did not mean to guarantee that any considerable opposition would be raised during the Recess to the Bill. He merely wished to let the people know that they could now consider its merits. For this purpose he would vote against going into Committee that day, but he wished it to be clearly understood that whatever his own conviction might be, his vote was not to be taken as his view on the principle of the Bill.

Mr. SANDFORD said, he strongly objected to the Government Amendments, as being most unjust and one-sided, and he had been waiting to hear some arguments in favour of them. He failed to understand why, as proposed in those Amendments, in towns of 10,000 inhabitants the public-houses should be open and people allowed to drink, while in towns of 9,000 they should be closed and the people debarred from doing so. Were the heads or the stomachs stronger in the one than the other, or was there any impression that before affecting the large towns there should be an *experimentum in corpore vili?* He was opposed to legislation of the kind proposed, and although he believed excess in drinking to be the greatest vice that could be, yet he did not believe in the principle of making men sober by Act of Parliament. Much as he valued the lessons of temperance, he valued the freedom and liberty of the subject more, and should therefore vote against the Bill; but he should like to hear the opinions of the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland on the subject. He (Mr. Sandford) submitted that the hon. Member who had charge of the Bill should not now proceed further with it, and that he should leave the matter in the hands of the Government. At the same time, if the Government introduced next Session a measure based upon the extraordinary principles which were embodied in their present Amendments, he would give to it the most determined opposition.

Mr. E. COLLINS said, that up to the present time he had not in any way agreed with the views of his hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry (Mr. R. Smyth), and up to the present time he had not taken any part in the discussions in that House on the Bill. He had been anxious to hear the opinions of the people of Ireland, and that was the reason for his not having taken any part in the discussions. He respected the opinions of those hon. Members who had spoken on the Bill, and also those of a large proportion of the Irish people in reference to the measure; but he had seen on a recent occasion, when the measure was before the House, that the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland had said that he accepted its principle, and would introduce some Amendments in it which he hoped would be acceptable to the people of Ireland. He (Mr. E. Collins) had in his lifetime been as zealous an advocate of temperance as any hon. Member could be, and it was his desire to see a useful and effective measure passed that Session if possible; but he could not believe that the measure now before the House could be accepted by the people of Ireland, who were not prepared for it as a satisfactory settlement of the question. He would like to ask the hon. Gentleman the Mover and the advocates of the Bill if they had really thought of the hardship the shutting-up of the public-houses all Sunday would inflict upon large classes of industrious, hard-working people whose avocations in many places made a resort to them absolutely necessary? In the interest of the town which he had the honour to represent (Kinsale), he desired to state the effect which such a measure would have in relation to its inhabitants. The town was a great fishing station, to which, at certain times of the year, fishing-boats came to the number of 450, and each boat averaging eight people, gave a total of 3,600 engaged in the fishing trade, and a considerable proportion of them were Irish. Now, those industrious people were accustomed to have their beer, and on the only day on which they could rest, this Bill would, if passed into law, prevent them from getting it. In their case such a Bill as this would prove a source of not only great hardship and inconvenience, but would absolutely be productive of evil, and probably promote the acquisition of drinking habits where they did not exist. If they were prevented from getting a glass of beer or porter, they were not likely to drink water to their dinner; and they would be driven, if they did drink water, to mix that water with whiskey, a beverage in which, at present as a whole, they did not indulge. Was that a desirable result of legislation? In the interest of those poor fishermen he protested against a measure which appeared to him only calculated to promote illicit drinking and a change in their habits, which must lead to vice. He had no doubt that the supporters of the Bill were anxious for the elevation and improvement of the people of Ireland; but while there was so much difference of opinion as to the particular mode in which they proposed to effect their object, while there were so many conflicting statements as to the wishes of the Irish people themselves, he earnestly appealed to them that they should at all events accept in principle the Amendments which had been proposed, so that some conclusion might be arrived at that year, and that they might have a Bill which would last for a period of three years, during which time there would be full opportunity for further considering the question. If the measure was found to be a bad one, it could be repealed; and if it turned out a good one, then it could be extended. He appealed, also, to the opponents of the Bill, not to embarrass the Government by pressing their views too hardly upon them. If some arrangements, however, were not come to which would give a chance of legislation being carried that year, he should feel it his duty to vote against a measure which, as it stood, seemed to him to be unworthy of the political leaders of Ireland, and which, if passed, would cause great inconvenience, especially in the large towns, without lessening drunkenness.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS - BEACH said, that he should not go into the general question as it had already been fully discussed. He had shown, on a previous stage of the Bill, that the Government had no wish to defeat its progress by delay, and he should have preferred, if possible, to postpone giving reasons for his Amendments until they were in Committee upon the Bill. After the remarks, however, which had fallen from some hon. Members, and especially from the hon. Member for Maldon (Mr. Sandford) and the hon. Baronet the Member for King's County (Sir Patrick O'Brien) it would not be possible for him to allow the debate to be concluded without stating the reasons which had induced him to place his Amendments on the Paper, and explaining the policy of the Government with regard to this measure. In speaking on the original Motion of the hon. Member for Derry, he expressed his doubts as to the views embodied in it being supported by the people of Ireland; and he further doubted if what was proposed would have the effect of stopping drunkenness. This debate had shown that there was no little want of unanimity among the Irish Members in reference to the Bill that was before the House; but, as the Motion of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. R. Smyth) for total Sunday closing was carried by a large majority against the proposal of the Government for simply limiting the hours of Sunday trading, the Government felt bound to accept the decision of the House on the principle, but with the understanding that they would propose in Committee such limitations of its application as appeared to them necessary. It was for that reason he had placed his Amendments on the Paper. It had always been admitted, even by the advocates of Sunday closing in Ireland, that the difficulty of carrying their proposal into effect would be in large towns rather than in the country at large. The police Returns as to those towns showed that a very large number of the inhabitants made use of public-houses on Sunday, and that therefore the adoption of the measure would in such places be a considerable interference with the habits of the inhabitants. They must also not forget that among the comparatively few Irish Members who opposed the measure were the Representatives of the largest towns, including Dublin, Cork, and Waterford; that neither of the hon. Members for Limerick had ever supported it; and though the hon. Members for Belfast were in its favour, yet, from a meeting which had been held in that town the other day, it appeared that a very large proportion of those classes who would be most affected by the Bill were opposed to it. That being so, what had the Government to consider? Having accepted the principle of the Bill, they had to consider to what extent and for how long that principle should be applied. The police Returns showed that in the large towns total Sunday closing would be attended with very considerable risk, not so much of riot or violence as of widespread evasion of the law. It was therefore thought advisable that they should proceed tentatively, and apply the Bill at first in the country, merely shortening the hours of opening in the larger towns. This was no departure from the principle of the Bill, for Ireland was not a country of large towns, and the towns which would be affected by his Amendment had only 836,000 inhabitants, while the population left under the Bill would be about 4,500,000. It was clear, therefore, that the Bill, if amended as proposed to by the Government, would still affect Sunday closing in the case of the large proportion of the population of Ireland. It was said by the hon. Baronet the Member for King's County that this was a slur upon the country population; but he had never heard such a view taken of the present law, under which, both in England and Ireland, the hours during which public-houses were open were shorter in the country than in towns. In his view, the question was mainly one of public convenience; and he, therefore, thought the limitation he had suggested would be only reasonable, safe, and right in the event of the Bill becoming law. They had proposed also to limit the Bill as to time, because they regarded it as an experiment; and thought that during the three years of its duration there would be time for collecting information, and for deciding whether its operation should be extended, diminished, or abandoned. If it was successful, the hon. Member opposite (Mr. R. Smyth) could come to that House with his case strengthened, asking for a still further extension of Sunday closing. He denied that the case of Scotland, referred to by the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren), helped the promoters of the Bill. The fact that Sunday closing was a success in Scotland did not show that, therefore, it would be a success in Ireland, for it should be recollected that before the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act there were in Edinburgh 974 public-houses, of which 490 only were open on Sunday, so that a large proportion of the public-houses had themselves voluntarily put the principle in force before the law existed. It was very different in Ireland. In spite of six-day licences, and the pressure brought to bear in favour of them, very few of such licences were taken by the publicans in large towns there. There was, therefore, a considerable difference in the circumstances connected with the two countries. With respect to the Bill, he himself most sincerely hoped that they would be allowed to go into Committee, and that the Amendments he had placed on the Paper would be accepted. If that were done he believed that it would be possible even in this Session to pass the Bill, and thus enable a fair experiment to be made of the proposal which had been adopted by the House.

Mr. S. MOORE said, he thought there was a mistake in supposing that the Bill was very generally wished for in Ireland. There had no doubt been many Petitions presented in its favour, but these Petitions had been got up by a society whose express business it was to do so, and many of them came from England, Wales, and Scotland, and could in no sense whatever be held to represent the feelings and wishes of the Irish people. He admitted the evils of excessive drinking, but he did not see why Ireland should be singled out for such an arbitrary measure of class legislation. He looked upon the measure as an unjust and unreasonable interference with the habits of the poorer and industrious classes, while it left the richer classes untouched. He hoped that the hon. Member who had charge of the Bill would withdraw it; but if the Bill went into Committee he would vote against the Amendments of the Government, and if the Motion were pressed to a division he would vote for the rejection of the Bill.

Mr. CALLAN, in supporting the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Dublin (Mr. Brooks), expressed his regret that the promoters of the Bill had not carried out what was generally felt to be the authorized suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham when he invited the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary to place his Amendments upon the Table. It was then generally understood that if that were done, so as to afford the people of Ireland during the Recess an opportunity of considering the proposals of the Government, the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. R. Smyth) would not proceed further with his Bill. On that belief many of the opponents of the measure took their departure. One hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford he (Mr. Callan) might say had shaken the dust of this Pagan city off his feet. The junior Member for Louth, the Member for Drogheda, and others had left for Ireland in full confidence that the House, with characteristic fair dealing, would prevent this Bill from being carried through in the absence of the Irish Members at that late period of the Session. But as the supporters of the Bill had not redeemed this implied promise, and as they were now determined at all hazards and under all difficulties to force the Bill on an unwilling House and an unwilling country, he thought it desirable that the House should fully understand what the opinion of Ireland was upon this point. A great deal had been said about Petitions, but before they were heard of, a kind of pocket pistol was presented at the head of the Irish Members in the form of an "electoral requisition." He had had the honour of representing Dundalk since 1868, and notwithstanding a determined Whig opposition at the last Election, he was returned free of expense as the avowed opponent of Sunday closing. He supported the Permissive Bill on the same principle that he opposed Sunday closing, as he wished to give each district the option of carrying a law approved by the inhabitants. He had been informed by a prominent supporter of the Alliance that he supported the Sunday Closing Bill in the interests of the artizan population and of the employers of labour, because the firm of Sir John Brown and Co., of Sheffield, with which he was connected, employing 7,000 hands, lost £35,000 in consequence of the drunkenness of the *employés* on Monday morning. But that was no reason for applying this Bill to Ireland, where an employer in a neighbouring town to his (Mr. Callan's) told him that not one of his 1,000 hands was ever late on Monday morning; and he was authorized by the junior Member for Cork (Mr. Goulding)—who had been obliged to leave for Ireland in order to receive in a befitting manner, with his constituents, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland — to state that the 7,000 people employed by his firm were as regular in their attendance on Monday morning as when they came on Saturday evening to receive their wages. If such was the state of affairs, it was evident that the argument founded on the alleged drunkenness of the artizans of Ireland was founded on incorrect information furnished to Members on false pretences. As to the Petitions he had presented, one was from his own town, signed by 2,100 inhabitants, as well as an electoral pocket-pistol signed by 264 electors. He was returned for Dundalk unpledged on this question; but if he had the slightest doubt as to the opinion of his constituents, he would not think of voting; but he was confident that when the people of Ireland saw that there was some chance of this Bill being passed unless they spoke out openly, their answer would be one of hostility to the Bill. There were, however, Petitions against the Bill. He was surprised that the Society for Sunday Closing in Ireland, who had exhibited so much wisdom, caution, and cleverness in their manipulation of the Bill and the Petitions in its favour, should have allowed their English assistants to run a muck in getting up Petitions; for on examination he found that the Petitions in favour of Sunday closing were from almost every town and Body which, in an earlier part of the Session, petitioned for the suppression of Monastic and Conventual Institutions. That was a fact which the people of Ireland ought to know. Would the hon. Member for Londonderry or any of his supporters rise in his place and say that the wishes of the people of Ireland were to be represented by Bodies which had presented Petitions against the dearest and most revered institutions of their religion? Again, he found that the Petitions from Ireland in 1869 against the Bill for the Disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland emanated from the same Bodies that now asked for Sunday closing. At considerable trouble he had gone through the newspapers in the last two years to see the addresses issued by the different Members for Ireland when wooing their constituents. The Address of the hon. Member for Londonderry was an able production, but he failed to find in it the slightest reference to the burning question of Sunday closing. Neither did the addresses of the defeated candidates allude to it. Since the present Parliament met, hon. Members had addressed their constituents, but they made no reference to that question. For example, the hon. Member for Kilkenny (Mr. B. Whitworth), one of the most respected supporters of the movement, mentioned in his address Home Rule, amendment of the Land Laws, reform of the Grand Jury Laws, amelioration of the condition of the Irish people, and a number of other interesting topics; but he did not make the slightest allusion to Sunday closing. Yet, if the Irish people felt so very strongly on this point, would not some allusion have been made to it in these addresses? He heard a challenge made to one of the Members for Cork County that he should resign his seat with his Colleague, and both appeal to their constituents on the two "burning questions" of the day—Sunday Closing and Home Rule; and he offered to bet the amount of his election expenses that the opponent of Home Rule would be routed with disgrace, but the opponent of Sunday Closing and the advocate of Home Rule would be returned. During the Recess that would be a very good way of ascertaining the opinion of the people of Ireland. If the hon. Member for Londonderry would resign his seat, and test the question, if he came back, he would return with renewed authority, and, if not, he would be regretted by all who had the pleasure of his acquaintance. Much had been said about the united phalanx from Ulster. He believed every Ulster Member voted in favour of this Bill. During eight years he had taken part in every division on any measure of a coercive character relating to Ireland, and on every occasion he had seen the Ulster Members go into the Lobbies with the supporters of those measures, except in the present Parliament, which included Members who had won seats on the Liberal side. He thought both sides had gone rather wide of the mark in their prophecies as to the beneficial or injurious effects of this measure, as was shown by two cartoons in a Dublin publication, called *Zosimus*, depicting the results of Sunday closing in domestic life from opposite points of view. During the last year he had visited the City of Dublin, and gone round to the public-houses on Saturday night and Sunday to see for himself the character of the people assembled there. He found them just the same as in club-houses and private society—mixed and middling; good, bad, and indifferent. He had consulted the artizans, and he knew that their opinions were well expressed in some of the newspapers, which represented, more than many hon. Members in that House, the opinions of the people. They objected to the Bill as being opposed to the wishes of the Irish people. With reference to legislating in accordance with the wishes of the people, of which they had heard so much, he would remind the House that at 9 o'clock on the previous night one of the Ulster Members, the senior Member for Tyrone (Mr. Macartney) got up in his place under the shadow of the Speaker's Chair and directed attention to the fact that there were not 40 Members present. Considering the importance of the question which was to be discussed, that act did not show true regard for Irish interests. And when the Division Lists were examined it was seen that, with the exception of two respected Presbyterian Members—the Members for Londonderry and Cavan Counties—the Ulster Members to a man either absented themselves or voted against what the hon. Member for Londonderry would admit to be the overwhelming opinion in Ireland in favour of amnesty. The Ulster Members, particularly on the Conservative side of the House, were most ready to talk of yielding to the public opinion of Ireland upon coercive measures or questions which ran in the same groove as their own ideas, but they treated the opinions of the people in the other Provinces with unmerited contempt. But both the Members for Cork County might be regarded as opponents of the Bill, as well as such Representatives for large and influential populations as the Members for Youghal, Kinsale, and Mayo. By meeting together on Sundays the people enjoyed opportunities for the interchange of opinion which tended to foster a national and independent spirit; and he would ask whether any hon. Member present, unless he belonged to the Permissive Bill Association, would venture to propose such a measure as that for London? From a report of a meeting at Belfast on Monday, "held by order of the mayor"—a military style adopted in Belfast which would commend itself to the hon. and gallant Member for Brighton (General Shute)—at which a series of resolutions were adopted against the Government Amendments, he perceived that it was the Sabbatarian spirit which prompted the supporters of this Bill. As regarded the demoralizing effect of the restrictions proposed by the legislation now before the House, he would only refer hon. Members to the case of Scotland, where similar legislation was already carried out. He would only say that if applied to Ireland the result would be to breed amongst the people a feeling of contempt for the law and its administrators, and——

And it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 3rd August, 1876.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee* — Winter Assizes* (200).
Third Reading—Parochial Records* (194), and *passed.*

LORD LIEUTENANTS—CHOICE OF MAGISTRATES.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

THE EARL OF SANDWICH: My Lords, I wish to trouble your Lordships for a few moments with a personal matter relating to a charge brought against me by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright). That right hon. Gentleman, a Member of the late Cabinet, in a speech addressed to the other House upon a Bill now pending there, stated that, among other grivances suffered by Nonconformists, I had carefully excluded Nonconformists from the Commission of the Peace in the county of Huntingdon, of which county I am Lord Lieutenant. To that statement I give my most distinct and unqualified denial. I will tell your Lordships how the matter arose. At the last General Election, Mr. Arthur Arnold was a candidate for the borough of Huntingdon. I suppose he thought himself a fit successor to the distinguished men who had in turn represented that borough — Pollock, Peel, and Baring. Mr. Arnold, however, was not elected; and, being no doubt very much annoyed at his ill success, he wrote a letter to Mr. Gladstone, the late Premier, declaring that I had distinctly refused to admit Nonconformists to the Commission of the Peace. Mr. Gladstone did not take the course which I should have expected him to take, and which I submit would have been the proper course—namely, to apply to me to know whether the statement was correct—but he at once assumed that the case was so, and replied to Mr. Arnold, recommending him to write to the Lord Chancellor. The Lord Chancellor, being thus appealed to, gave a very dignified and proper answer—to the effect that he did not think a proper time to enter into such a matter was during the heat of a contested election; and, further, that if, at any time, any complaint was to be made upon such a subject, it should, in his opinion, come from a gentleman connected with the county, and not from a stranger, and should be addressed to him directly and not indirectly through another. In this opinion I thoroughly agree, and I think your Lordships will also be of opinion that, under all the circumstances, Mr. Arnold was not the man to make such a complaint. My Lords, I can only give a general denial to the statement. In making the appointments to the magistracy I have exercised my discretion without reference to either religion or politics. If there are so few Nonconformists on the Bench for the County of Huntingdon, the fault is not mine, but probably arises from the fact that there are so few Nonconformists in the county. I have never made politics a ground of disqualification for the magistracy, still less have I entered into religious questions in deciding upon the fitness of gentlemen for this office. It is impossible for me to know the religious opinions of the different gentlemen whose names are submitted to me, and the course I have usually followed has been to apply to the different chairmen of petty sessions, or else some gentleman in the district, so as to ascertain from those who are best qualified to give the information whether the gentleman recommended to me is a proper person to be appointed. That, I think, is the right course to adopt; and I can only repeat that I have never in any one instance suffered politics or religion to influence me in making appointments to the magistracy.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON: Perhaps I may say that when Mr. Arnold wrote the letter to which my noble Friend refers, my noble Friend did me the honour of consulting me as to the course he should take. I then told him I thought his reputation as Lord Lieutenant of the county stood so high that it would be beneath his dignity to take any notice of a letter written, not to himself to complain of what had occurred, but to another person. I said that if his conduct as Lord Lieutenant of the county was to be found fault with, it should be in this House, where he would have an opportunity of explaining his conduct and the course he had taken. My noble Friend followed that advice and took no further notice of the charge then made against him, and I think he acted wisely in not bringing it forward. On the present occasion I think he has been justified in making this explanation, considering the charge has been repeated by a gentleman of such high position as the right hon. Member for Birmingham.

GASLIGHT AND COKE COMPANY BILL.

THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, it was, no doubt, unusual to oppose a Private Bill on the third reading; but he had opposed the Bill at a previous stage, and should have accepted that decision but for a complete change of circumstances. On the last occasion on which this subject was discussed the noble Marquess who had charge of the Bill contradicted him when he stated that it was promoted by the Board of Trade. He (the Earl of Camperdown) could not contradict the statement at the time; but on looking at the Bill subsequently, he found that Sir Charles Adderley's name was at the back of it. Moreover, the Permanent Secretary of the Board of Trade was the first witness examined before the Committee. What the Board of Trade desired was that there should be an uniform supply of gas, the initial price being 3*s.* 9*d.*, all over the metropolis. There were at that time two Bills before the House, and a third relating to the South of London was before the other House. But this latter Bill was objected to by the parishes of Camberwell and Lambeth on the ground that the Company had for years been supplying gas at 3*s.* 6*d.*, and that if they were empowered to raise the price it would increase the income of the Company very greatly to the injury of the consumers, and the Bill fell through. Therefore, their Lordships would have to consider next year what was the proper initial price for the south side of London. There were some doubts about the South Metropolitan Gas Bill; but it had now come on for the third reading, and the Company had thus, by their own motion, procured the passing of a measure which would limit the charge in their district to 3*s.* 6*d.* Bills on this subject were continually coming out and in like rabbits in a warren; and generally ended by disappearing, and it seemed to him it was highly desirable that when their Lordships legislated on this subject they should consider it thoroughly and all at one time. They were now asked to pass the present Bill, which related only to the northern portion of London, and thereby to prejudge the question. If, however, they sanctioned the charge of 3*s.* 9*d.*, they would not be doing what the Board of Trade originally proposed, because that Department wished to have an uniform charge of 3*s.* 9*d.* all over the metropolis. If their Lordships passed this Bill they could not retreat from the position they had taken up; and therefore he hoped they would not agree to the third reading.

Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("upon this day three months.")—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY, said, the noble Earl (the Earl of Camperdown) had spoken of these Bills springing up like rabbits coming from their holes, but he did not know what inference the noble Earl desired their Lordships to draw from this metaphor. As a matter of fact the present Bill had passed through all the ordinary stages and been subjected to all the precautions usually applied to measures of this kind. The Bill, moreover, had been approved by the Board of Trade, the Metropolitan Board of Works, and the Corporation of the City of London. It was introduced into the House of Commons, was examined by a Committee there, as it was subsequently by a Committee of their Lordships' House. It had been discussed on going into Committee of the Whole House and approved by their Lordships, and it certainly was a remarkable course to take to move the rejection on the third reading after all these siftings and discussions. There was one advantage, at all events, in the present proposal of the noble Earl, for there was no doubt now as to whether the effect of his action would be to destroy the Bill. The last time this matter was before the House there was considerable difference of opinion as to whether the result of the noble Earl's Motion would be the rejection of the measure, but there could be no doubt as to the object of the present Motion. The noble Earl said that if their Lordships sanctioned a charge of 3*s*. 9*d*. they would never be able to retreat from it. Well, if that were a danger we were exposed to it already, for Parliament had sanctioned a charge of 3*s*. 9*d*. in the case of these Companies. If this Bill did not pass they would continue to make that charge; and if the Bill did pass there were means provided in it for reducing the charge in proportion as the dividend of the Company increased. Indeed, in the opinion of competent persons it was likely that at an early period some reduction in the charge would be made—and it was probable that it would be a larger reduction than 3*d*., which was the object of the noble Earl's movement. If the dividend were raised even as much as 11 per cent the price would be reduced to 3*s*. 5*d*., and this would be a larger gain to the consumer than that which was contemplated by the noble Earl. The probability was that any hostile action would force the Companies to recede from a position in which great advantages were already guaranteed by Act of Parliament; and the real question at issue was whether the House would prefer a bird in the hand to two in the bush, or, in other words, the almost certainty of having the price of gas reduced according to a sliding scale provided for in the Bill, or the putting the matter off for an indefinite period on the chance that the noble Earl by the unaided weight of his own eloquence might persuade the two Houses of Parliament to that which Parliament had never done before. There were reasons why the price of gas in the South of the metropolis should be somewhat higher than in the North, because the area being smaller the capital required was larger in proportion to the consumption than it would be in the North.

VISCOUNT CARDWELL said, the observations of the noble Marquess would mislead the House as to the law in regard to at least some of the Companies. It was not correct to say that if this Bill were rejected the Companies would have the absolute power to charge 3*s*. 9*d*. in perpetuity, because the existing Acts provided the limit that the dividend was not to exceed 10 per cent; and there was also this further limit, that the Board of Trade could be applied to for an inquiry as to whether 3*s*. 9*d*. was or not a necessary amount, in order that the Company might be enabled to pay that dividend with due care and management. As to the greater expenditure of capital in proportion to consumption of gas in the South of the Metropolis as compared with the North, it should be borne in mind that the consumption of gas increased very rapidly, and as population increased in the South so would the consumption of gas increase also. The consumer ought to have the benefit of this, but by this Bill they would be able to divide more by having the advantage of the cheaper production of gas. The time would also probably come when there would be some improvement in the institutions of the metropolis, and probably gas would be placed in the hands of some public body. Such a body would have to purchase up the great Gas Companies, and it would have to purchase also an additional property, which the Government by this Bill were seeking to make provision for.

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 34; Not-Contents 21: Majority 13.

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

Bill read 3ª accordingly, with the Amendments, and *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

NORTH AMERICA—EXTRADITION.

ADJOURNED DEBATE RESUMED.

Adjourned debate on the Motion of Earl GRANVILLE—"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for further Correspondence respecting Extradition," *resumed* (according to Order).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I have to express my great obligation to your Lordships for your indulgence in permitting me to-night to resume the discussion of this question. I shall endeavour to show my gratitude by compressing, as far as the importance of the subject will permit, the remarks I have to make. I think I shall make my observations more distinct if I remind your Lordships at the outset that there are connected with this subject two questions which are perfectly separable the one from the other. The first is whether upon the subject of Extradition there ought to be a new Treaty made between this country and the United States, and what should be the character of that Treaty; and the other is whether Her Majesty's Government, in executing the Treaty which exists and the powers which they possess, have properly interpreted their duty. The importance of keeping these two questions distinct was, I think, clearly manifested during the debate the other night. The noble Earl who introduced the Motion (Earl Granville) stated very fairly that he did not propose to enter into the question of a negotiation for a new Treaty, but he would confine himself entirely to what had already occurred; but your Lordships will recollect that a noble Earl who is not now present (Earl Grey), in addressing himself to the subject, scarcely bestowed a word upon the conduct of the Government in reference to what has already passed, but, with great point and ability, addressed himself to the general question as to what, according to his judgment, ought to be the character of the Extradition arrangements between two such countries as Great Britain and the United States. Upon one of these questions I do not propose to say more than a single word. The subject of the arrangements to be made for the future is one which may now be taken to be under negotiation. Her Majesty's Government have informed the Government of the United States that they are prepared to enter upon that negotiation without any bias and without any prejudice arising from the correspondence which has passed between the two Governments. I am perfectly willing to confess there are many points in respect of which the arrangements between the two countries may be improved; and I think I shall have the assent of all your Lordships when I say this was a question upon which the interests of Great Britain and of the United States are not only not antagonistic, but are absolutely identical. I have heard some calculations made as to the relative advantages which an Extradition Treaty bestowed upon the two countries; but I cannot see any difference whatever between the advantages to one country and to the other. I have seen it stated that you ought to take into account and compare the probable number of criminals which each country will have to demand back from the other. If we were able to ascertain that there were two countries, one of which would require the surrender of 10 and the other the surrender of 100 criminals, still I should maintain that the interests of the two countries were entirely identical. Of course it is the interest of a country to obtain the surrender of a criminal, and to put him on trial for the offence which he has committed; but I maintain that it is equally the interest of the country of which that criminal, if he be a criminal, has made an asylum to get rid of his presence. The country in which he has taken refuge is in this position—it cannot try him for the offence he has committed abroad, because it has been committed out of its jurisdiction, and it cannot have his presence without danger of the recurrence of the crime in consequence of which he has been obliged to take refuge.

Having stated that, I now come to what really is the grave question raised by the noble Earl—I mean the course which the Government has taken in the late negotiations with the United States. It is extremely important to bear in mind, in a matter of this kind, what the position of the Government is. *Primâ facie* every person who takes refuge in this country, who makes this country an asylum, has a right to remain in it, and cannot be removed from it. But the Government of this country is made by the Legislature the depositary or trustees of certain powers, by the exercise of which that individual may be handed over to the country from which he has originally come. It is the duty of the Government to construe those powers accurately, and to execute them up to the letter of their power, and the Government have no authority to go one jot beyond the power which the Legislature has entrusted to them. What the powers are which are entrusted to the Government must, of course, be determined by looking at the nature of the authority which the Government has received, and it is upon the construction of that authority that the difference in the present instance has arisen. Let me remind your Lordships what are the two constructions which have been placed on the powers given to the Government of this country with reference to the extradition of persons alleged to be criminals. The construction which was placed by the noble Earl (Earl Granville) upon the power of the Government is this—the noble Earl, adopting the argument of the Government of the United States, contends that there are certain crimes for any one of which the Government of the United States may require the surrender of a criminal who is within this country. The noble Earl says the person must be accused of the crime, and evidence must be given which would justify his committal in this country; and if such evidence be given he is to be handed over to the United States; but once he is handed over to the United States the noble Earl contends it is in the power of the United States and the Courts of that country, provided they go through the form of trying him in the first instance for the offence for which he is surrendered, to try him afterwards for any offence greater or smaller which may be alleged against him. That is the construction which the noble Earl puts upon the duty and the authority of the Government of this country. On the other hand, Her Majesty's Government put this construction on their authority—they say they are ready to entertain the demand for the extradition of any person alleged to have committed any of the offences mentioned in the Treaty; they are ready to hear evidence of the criminality of the person; and if the evidence amounts to that which would justify a magistrate in committing that person for trial in this country, he is to be handed over to the Government and the Courts of the United States; but he is to be handed over to be tried for that offence only, and if acquitted of that offence he is not to be tried for any other offence he may have committed. That is the issue between us. It appears to me a very simple one, and I think I shall be able to satisfy your Lordships —not by any legal arguments, but by the application of common sense to the construction of common words, that the construction which Her Majesty's Government have placed on their duty is the true and correct construction. My Lords, before I come to the Treaty which exists between this country and the United States I desire to make a few observations. The noble Earl (Earl Granville) said the other night with great accuracy that the extradition of criminals or alleged criminals was founded upon the comity of nations. Extradition is not an obligation created by Treaty. It has been regulated and moulded by certain countries through the medium of Treaties, but properly speaking it is founded upon the comity of nations, upon principles higher and broader than ever can be laid down in any Treaty. My Lords, it so happens that Great Britain and the United States have been rather lagging behind on the matter of Extradition. Extradition was known for years before any Treaty existed between this country and the United States; and when a Treaty came to be made between this country and the United States it was made in order to supplement the power of the Executive Government, and not for the purpose of introducing any greater laxity into the general principle of Extradition. Now, my Lords, what are the rules laid down with regard to Extradition in those countries where it has prevailed much longer than in this country and the United States? Nay, what is the cardinal rule on the subject of Extradition? I have consulted the great jurists who have written on this subject on the Continent, and I will now lay before your Lordships what has been said by one of them who wrote not very far distant from the time when the Treaty was made between this country and the United States. I take the treatise of Fælix on Private International Law, in which an entire chapter is devoted to the subject of Extradition. The author enumerates all the Treaties which at the time he wrote existed between the different countries on the Continent; but he lays down as higher and older than any of the provisions in any of those Treaties certain general rules which he says are implied in the whole question of Extradition, and which govern it in all countries at all times. And this is one of his general rules—

> "The person who is surrendered cannot be prosecuted or condemned except for the crime in respect to which his extradition has been obtained."

My Lords, is there any doubt about the meaning of those words? The rule is not that he must be tried first for the crime on which he has been surrendered, and that then he may be tried for any other, but that he must be tried for the crime on which he has been surrendered, and for that crime only. And, my Lords, what is the practice observed in France? The Minister of Justice, in a circular dated the 15th of April, 1841, lays down the following rules on the subject of Extradition:—

> "The extradition declares the offence which leads to it, and this offence alone ought to be inquired into. So that if during the prosecution for the crime which has led to the extradition there should arise the evidence of a new crime, a new demand of extradition ought to be made."

But, my Lords, that is not all. In a book with which some of your Lordships are well acquainted, Dalloy's *Jurisprudence* I find a remarkable case in point which occurred between France and Geneva. A man of the name of Dermenon had been surrendered for trial for fraudulent bankruptcy. He was acquitted on that charge; but there was another against him for which he had not been surrendered. Then this is what I find—

> "The Procureur-Général to the Royal Court of Dijon asks whether he must be brought before the Tribunal of Correctional Police of that city or sent back to Geneva to be placed at the disposal of the Government which has surrendered him. The Keeper of the Seals thinks that the later alternative should be adopted. The letter written by the Minister of the Interior to the Prefect of the Côte d'Or to inform him of his decision runs thus:—'It is only as accused of the crime of fraudulent bankruptcy that Dermenon has been delivered up to France by the Canton of Geneva. He is now purged of that charge by the decree of acquittal. Dermenon is therefore in the same position as if only a misdemeanour had been laid to his charge. It is clear that in that case his extradition could not have been obtained. It follows that we cannot take advantage of his having been given up to the French authorities upon a different ground to try him for acts which have not and could never have been the grounds of his extradition. The Minister of Justice has consequently directed the Procureur-Général to place Dermenon at your disposal, and I hasten, for my part, to request you to have him conducted immediately to the frontier, where he should be placed once more in the hands of the Genevese authorities.'"

That is pretty strong as to the principle on which France proceeded—a principle which forms the foundation of Extradition and does not depend on the mere wording of any Treaty whatever. But is France alone in this matter? I turn to a jurist of Holland, Kluit, who has written a very interesting treatise on the Surrender of Fugitives, in which he says—

> "Is it lawful to punish the fugitive for any other crime than that for which he has been surrendered? The request for the surrender of a criminal is generally accompanied by a statement of the grounds on which it is made. The State in which he has taken refuge ought not to surrender him until those grounds have been made clear to it; in other words, it should ascertain whether the crime committed is of a character to justify his surrender. In truth, the criminal by his flight to another State becomes (although but for a time) the subject of the supreme power of that State, and immediately enjoys the protection and guardianship of that State. From that guardianship he cannot be forcibly taken except under a special agreement, the terms of which, we presume, certainly do not extend further than to those very grounds on which the surrender was demanded and granted. Therefore, if a State were to demand the extradition of a fugitive for a given crime, and then, letting the charge of this crime drop, were to bring him to trial and inflict punishment on him for some other crime committed by him, the mutual confidence existing between the two nations would be seriously impaired by an extradition demanded in so dishonest and underhand a manner. The surrendering State could not, indeed, though rightly maintaining that it had suffered an injury, at once do anything to prevent the perpetration of this fraud—for it would be absurd to fly at once to arms—yet it appears that it could fairly demand, through the medium of its Ministers representing it in the country of the other State, that the injury should be repaired

—as, for example, by sending back the surrendered criminal; and in such a case it will be quite fair that all extradition shall be consistently refused to the offending State for the future, so that no handle may be given to unjust persecutions. . . . . . And even if it be not fraud, but only carelessness, that leads to a State, after demanding and obtaining the surrender of a criminal, to bring him to trial on some other charge than that for which he was surrendered, such a proceeding should not on that account be passed over. The surrendering State gave up the criminal on consideration of the grounds stated, not of any different grounds. It may be alleged that it was a fair presumption and argument to say that the surrendering State would have been likely to surrender with much greater willingness a man accused of more crimes than one than a man accused of one only. But, on the other hand, it is a fair observation to make that that State might have declined to grant the surrender had it known that the other State would bring the criminal to trial on such a charge. Because it surrendered a man accused of incendiarism or murder, it must not be presumed that it would be equally willing to surrender one for political reasons, for persecution on account of religion, or for any trivial infringement of the law."

Finally, I turn to a German writer, Heffter, who states—

> "The individual whose extradition has been granted cannot be prosecuted or tried for any crime except that for which the extradition has been obtained. To act in any other way, and to cause him to be tried for other crimes or misdemeanours, would be to violate the mutual principle of asylum and the silent clause contained by implication in every extradition."

Now, my Lords, I think these authorities—and they might be multiplied—will satisfy your Lordships that apart altogether from the wording of Treaties, there is a silent and implied condition in Extradition that the crime for which the surrender of a man is asked must be specified, and that it is for that crime alone that he must be tried. I am absolutely unaware of any authority who has ever written the other way. So much for the general principle. Until I hear the contrary, I think I am entitled to ask your Lordships to hold with me, that it is the general principle of Extradition that a man is to be tried only for the offence for which he is surrendered.

I now come to the Treaty of 1842 and to the British Act of Parliament which gave effect to it. I take the Treaty first. What does it provide? It embraces certain offences—namely, murder, assaults and attempts to murder, forgery, the uttering of forged paper, piracy, robbery, and arson. It takes those seven offences, and authorizes a demand and a surrender by way of Extradition of any person who is accused of one of these offences provided—I speak, of course, with regard to this country—the evidence given amounts to that which, according to British law, would justify a person's being committed in this country for trial. I ask what is the reason why seven offences out of the whole catalogue of crime are singled out, and why, also, there is this provision made—that the evidence given must be such would show a *primâ facie* criminality according to British law? What is the theory which would explain why this provision was made in the Treaty? I listened with some anxiety to hear whether the noble Earl had any theory on this point. I have heard two theories—one suggested by the noble Earl and the other suggested elsewhere. I have seen it said that the reason why the Treaty provides that this evidence of criminality according to British law is to be given is merely to guard against arbitrary arrests. But that is no answer at all, because it does not explain the reason why seven crimes are singled out. If the only object was to guard against arbitrary arrest, it would be sufficient to say that a man may be surrendered for any crime whatever, provided there is *primâ facie* evidence according to British law. But the suggestion of the noble Earl is that those seven offences only are taken because the object was not to invoke that cumbrous administrative machinery of the two countries and put it in motion for anything except large and considerable crimes? But I ask him are these seven the only large and considerable crimes? What does the noble Earl say to embezzlement, or to obtaining money under false pretences, or to manslaughter, or to rape, or to abduction—and I might name many others? None of these are mentioned in the Treaty—no provision whatever is made for them; and therefore, they being as considerable as the crimes that are mentioned, it cannot be that the object was to avoid the trouble of putting this cumbrous machinery in motion for insignificant offences. Now, I venture to give my explanation. The reason why the Treaty was framed in this way is a very simple one. It is that these seven offences are agreed upon between the two countries as the *delicta majora*, about which there could be no dispute, no controversy, as to whether they trench on political considerations or not. They are singled out and taken, as the only crimes for which Extradition is to be permitted; and evidence is to be given which shall show that the particular crime had been *primâ facie* committed according to British law in order that this country when it surrenders a person who is alleged to be a criminal may know beforehand what is the crime, and the only crime, for which he is to be tried, and what is the character of that state of facts which is said to lead up to and indicate that it has been committed. And the moment that you pass from the offences named in the Treaty, and the evidence in support of those offences, and say that afterwards the person surrendered may be tried for any other offence, you absolutely reduce to silence the whole of the provisions in the Treaty. For what is the object of specifying one offence, and being made the judge of the evidence with regard to it, if after his trial for it—which may be a mere formality and result in an acquittal, and show that he ought never to have been accused of that offence at all—he may be tried in the country to which he is surrendered for any other offence they may please to lay at his door? I may here quote one of the highest authorities in dealing with the subject—namely, the President of the United States. President Tyler communicated his Treaty by the Message to Congress. In a Message to the Senate he gave this explanation of the character of the Treaty. He said—

> "The Article on the subject in the proposed Treaty is carefully confined to such offences as all mankind agree to regard as heinous, and destructive of the security of life and property. In this careful and specific enumeration of crimes the object has been to exclude all political offences or criminal charges arising from wars or intestine commotions. Treason, misprision of treason, libels, desertion from military service, and other offences of similar character are excluded."

What is the use of excluding them if, after a surrender for any one of the offences named, the person may be tried for these other offences? Here is the Message of the President of the United States explaining the Treaty that was entered into, and explaining it in a sense which at once sweeps away the whole of the theory that a person can be tried for anything except what are called the crimes specifically enumerated—because if he could be tried for any one of the other offences the guarantee and safeguard on which President Tyler relied would be entirely removed.

So much for the Treaty. As far as this country is concerned, it does not rest merely on the Treaty. I find that Lord Ashburton, who negotiated the Treaty, on the 9th of August, 1842, wrote to Mr. Webster and told him—what all your Lordships know — that, although the negotiators had agreed to this Treaty, it could have no force against this country, except by the authority of Parliament, and therefore that the authority of Parliament must be obtained. Therefore, whatever terms the Parliament of this country imposed in the Act by which they gave their assent to the Treaty became part of the Treaty and govern its execution. What does the Act of Parliament which was to give it vitality, and which was passed in 1843 say? Your Lordships will observe that the form was this—that Parliament had to give to the Executive of this country power, which otherwise the Executive would not possess, of handing over the persons who were surrendered. No Secretary of State could issue a warrant or arrest any person in this country to be handed over to the United States, except by the authority of Parliament, and therefore Parliament had to ratify the Treaty and give authority for this particular act to be done. What is the language in which Parliament gave this authority? This is the third section of the Act, and it does not require a lawyer to construe it. It says, upon the certificate of the justice of the peace that the supposed offender has been committed to gaol—

> "It shall be lawful for one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State . . by warrant under his hand and seal to order the person so committed to be delivered to such person or persons as shall be authorized in the name of the United States to receive the person so committed to be delivered to such person or persons as shall be authorized in the name of the said United States to receive the person so committed, and to convey such person to the territories of the said United States"—

What for?—to be tried for all offences whatsoever? No, but—

> "to be tried for the crime of which such person shall be so accused." [6 & 7 *Vict.* c. 76. s. 3.]

That is the authority which Parliament

has given to the Secretary of State. Parliament has given no authority to the Secretary of State to hand over any man within the asylum of this country to be tried for all offences whatsoever. The authority, and the only authority, given to Her Majesty's Government is, after evidence given showing a *primâ facie* case of criminality as regards the particular offence, that of handing over a person to the United States to be tried for the crime of which such person shall be so accused. It is sometimes said that lawyers are given to special pleading. I am sorry to observe that the special pleading on this subject has not come from lawyers. I have seen it stated—and the argument of the noble Earl (Earl Granville) the other night requires him to maintain this proposition—that because there are no negative words, saying that he is not to be tried for any other offence, therefore he may be tried for any other offence. I should like to know, in regard to documents passing between man and man within this country, what would be thought of an argument like that? Suppose any one of your Lordships handed over a sum of money to a trustee and told him it was handed to him that he might invest it in a particular security—Consols. If the trustee said—"You told me I was to invest the money in Consols, but you did not say I was to invest it in nothing else. If I have invested the money in Consols, I can then invest it in any other securities I please." What, I ask, would be thought of that doctrine? The words here are clear. The person is surrendered by the Act of Parlianent to be tried for the offence of which he is accused, and so far as he is concerned, our duty is to protest against his being tried for any other offence. But, my Lords, I may go further, and refer to the circumstances under which the Act of 1843 was passed. The Act was not passed through Parliament in silence; it was fully debated in both Houses at the time. Those were the times when the Members of the great Liberal Party were peculiarly sensitive about the liberties of those who had received the hospitality of this country; and they were careful that no power was given or should be exercised which might unduly endanger those liberties. I have read the most striking speech of Lord Macaulay on the subject, which is contained in the Reports of the proceedings of the other House of Parliament, and also that which was delivered by Lord Aberdeen in this House, both of which were directed against the criticisms to which the measure had been subjected. [See 3 *Hansard*, lxxi. 564.] At that time slavery was an institution of the United States, and great apprehension was felt here that persons might be surrendered here for offences mentioned in the Treaty, and be subsequently tried in America for offences connected with their *status* as slaves and those who were defending the Treaty in both Houses of Parliament took one by one the offences for which persons were to be surrendered, and asserted that none of them would allow any person to be put on his trial for an offence committed as a slave. But, my Lords, if Lord Aberdeen in this House, and Sir Robert Peel in the other, had adopted the construction placed upon the Treaty by the noble Earl they would have said—"It is no use embarrassing yourselves about the effect of the particular offences named in the Treaty, because we candidly tell you that if once a man is surrendered under the Treaty, he can be tried for any offence whatever, whether arising out of his *status* as a slave or not." My Lords, had any Minister made such a statement as that in either House of Parliament in 1843 do your Lordships suppose that this Treaty would ever have received the assent of Parliament? But there is another matter which is of considerable importance in considering this case. The other night the noble Earl objected to any reference being made to the American Act of Congress passed in 1848, stating that the Americans themselves were the proper judges of the construction to be put upon their own Act. That view might perhaps be open to criticism, inasmuch as the Act of Congress is practically a transcript of the English Act, and may fairly be taken to have the same meaning. I will not, however, enter into any debateable ground upon this question which I can avoid, and therefore I will pass over the point as to what construction should be placed upon the Act of Congress. I must, however, refer to an American document which becomes of the utmost importance when we are construing the meaning to be placed upon the Treaty. I will ask your Lordships to allow me to read the warrant under which the United States surrender a prisoner to us. It is to be found in pages 69 and 70 of the Papers which have been laid before the House. This is the document which accompanies the prisoner when we receive him from the United States, and it contains the instructions which tell us what we are to do with him. The document is a very important one, and seems to my mind to be almost conclusive of the case. It is as follows:—

> "Now, therefore, pursuant to the provisions of Section 5272 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, these presents are to require the United States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York, or any other public officer or person having charge or custody of the aforesaid James Bowen, *alias* William Miller, to surrender and deliver him up to Adam Bligh, a constable of the united counties of Stormont, Dundas, and Glengarry, Canada, who has been authorized, in the name and on behalf of the British Government, by Her Majesty's Minister at this capital to receive him, or to any other person or persons who may in like manner be authorized, in the name or on behalf of the said Government to receive the said James Bowen, *alias* William Miller, to be tried for the crime of which he is accused."—[*N. A.* No 1 (1876), No. 153.]

Therefore we have on the one hand the British Parliament authorizing the Secretary of State "to hand over the person to be surrendered from this country to be tried in the United States for the crime for which he is accused," and we have on the other the Government of the United States issuing their warrant for the handing over to the officer authorized by Her Majesty to receive him in the United States a prisoner "to be tried for the crime of which he is accused." Both countries, therefore, use the same words, which can only fairly admit of one interpretation. So much, therefore, for the general principles which regulate the system of Extradition and for the documents which pass between the two countries, and which constitute the means by which it is carried into effect.

The noble Earl (Earl Granville) referred to a great many cases which have occurred since 1842, and said that he had got the evidence of public men and the evidence of witnesses which would show that the meaning which had always been placed upon the Treaty was different from that for which we contend. I can very shortly indeed put your Lordships in possession of all that appears to me to be material with regard to the cases that have occurred. By far the greater number of the cases cited by the noble Earl I put aside altogether as irrelevant. In that class of cases to which I refer, the prisoners who had been surrendered on one charge and who were being tried upon another themselves attempted to raise the defence that they could not be tried for an offence different from that for which they had been surrendered. Such cases certainly have no application whatever to the present question, because nothing can be more clear than that a prisoner himself has no right to raise such a defence. Even in France where, as I have shown your Lordships, the law and the practice of Extradition goes far beyond that which prevails in this country and in the United States, a prisoner is not permitted to set up such a defence, for the clear reason that he is within the jurisdiction of the Court which has the authority to try him for the offence of which he is charged, and that whether he ought to be tried for an offence other than that for which he has been surrendered is a matter of diplomacy between the two countries, and not of question between the prisoner and the Court before which he is being tried. That circumstance, therefore, disposes of by far the larger number of cases referred to by the noble Earl and by Mr. Fish. The cases really in point are only three in number. One is that of Heilbronn, which if the Government of this country had ever known and had approved what was done, it would not have been very creditable to this country. I will tell your Lordships what happened in that case. Heilbronn was a man who was brought up in New York under a proceeding of Extradition for the purpose of being sent home to this country in order to be tried here. He was charged in New York with robbery, and he grounded his defence upon the circumstance that the facts proved disclosed not robbery, but embezzlement, which was not an offence for which he could be surrendered under the Treaty. The Commissioner before whom the case was heard decided that the offence of which he was charged was robbery, and the man was surrendered and was sent over to this country for trial—and I may mention that the prosecution was conducted not by the Crown, but privately. When he was tried here this actually occurred—the Judge at once said that the facts showed that the offence committed was embezzlement, and not robbery, and the man was tried and sentenced for the former offence, for which he ought not to have been surrendered under the terms of the Treaty. That would not have been very creditable to the Government if they had ever heard of it; but the Government never did hear of it. It was never brought under their notice at the time of the prosecution, or until it was mentioned in the Committee of the other House in 1868. That was the case of Heilbronn. The other two cases were the cases of Burley and Caldwell. As to these cases it appears that the Law Officers of the day were consulted; and no person can speak with greater respect than I do of the Law Officers at these two particular dates. But I am bound to say that I should have liked to see the reasons assigned by the Law Officers for the opinions said to have been given by them, and I should have liked to know whether the attention of the Law Officers was called to the principles of Extradition to which I have referred, as well as to the other documents I have mentioned. Even if I were unable to agree with what appears to have been the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, if the result had been communicated to the American Government, and they had been told, "These are the principles upon which the British Government acted" I could understand the argument *ad hominem* now urged on behalf of the American Government—that this country should not depart from the solemn determination then arrived at. But, so far from that being the case, the American Government were never informed of the views said to have been entertained by the Law Officers of the Crown; and moreover, in the outset of the late Correspondence with the American Government those two cases were not referred to at all. The case of Burley was a singular one. It occurred in 1865. Burley had been surrendered to the United States from Canada on a charge of robbery. His friends in this country apprehended that he was going to be tried for piracy, and they appealed to the Foreign Office, asking that Her Majesty's Government would so far exert their good offices on his behalf as to secure "that he may not be tried on any other charge than that on which the claim was made for his Extradition." The Foreign Office thereupon answered the appeal, which was made by the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Dalglish), who was told that "Lord Russell had addressed to Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Washington such instructions as the case admits of." Now, observe what were the instructions sent to our Chargé d'Affaires, and what was the communication made by him to the American Minister. These are the instructions sent to Mr. Burnley, then our Chargé d'Affaires—

> "I have to state to you that, having considered this application in communication with the proper Law Advisers of the Crown, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that if the United States Government, having obtained the extradition of Burley on the charge of robbery, do not put him on his trial upon this charge, but upon another — namely, piracy (which, if it had been made before the Canadian authorities they might have held not sufficiently established to warrant his extradition), this would be a breach of good faith against which Her Majesty's Government might justly remonstrate. If, however, the United States Government does *boná fide* put Burley on his trial for the offence in respect to which he was given up, it seems to Her Majesty's Government that it would be difficult to question the right of that Government to put him upon his trial for piracy also, or any other offence which he may be accused of having committed within their territory, whether such an offence was or was not a ground of extradition or even within the Treaty." — [*North America*, No. 3 (1876), p. 20.]

This is a large view, and one with which I cannot concur. But now let us see what was the communication to Mr. Seward, founded upon this despatch. Mr. Burnley wrote to Mr. Seward—

> "Her Majesty's Government having considered this application, are of opinion that if the United States Government, having obtained the extradition on the charge of robbery, do not put him on his trial upon this charge, but upon another—namely, piracy, which, if it had been made before the Canadian authorities, they might have held not sufficiently established to warrant his extradition, this would be a breach of good faith, against which Her Majesty's Government might justly remonstrate. Her Majesty's Government are, therefore, willing, should the grounds upon which Burley is to be tried take the above turn, to comply so far with the application of Mr. Burley, senior, as to instruct me to protest against any attempt to change the ground of accusation upon which Burley was surrendered in pursuance of the Treaty."—[*Ibid.* p. 22.]

Now, if I had been Mr. Seward, receiving this despatch, without knowing what was behind, I should have said—"This is an expostulation with me against allowing a man to be tried for any offence but that on which he was surrendered." Mr. Seward, in fact, did so understand it, and thus replied—

> "The Honourable the Attorney General informs me that it is his purpose to bring the offender to trial in the Courts of the States of Ohio and Michigan for the crimes committed by him against the municipal laws of those States—namely, robbery and assault, with intent to commit murder. He was delivered up by the Canadian authorities upon a requisition which was based upon charges of those crimes, and also upon a charge of piracy."

This, I believe, was a mistake—

> "which is triable, not by State Courts, but by the Courts of the United States. I am not prepared to admit the principle claimed in the Protest of Her Majesty's Government, that the offender could not legally be tried for the crime of piracy under the circumstances of the case."

Mr. Seward thus shows that he considers it a protest against the principle of trying a prisoner for any other crime than that upon which he has been surrendered—

> "Nevertheless, the question raised upon it has become an abstraction, as it is at present the purpose of the Government to bring him to trial for the crimes against municipal law only."—[*North America*, No. 3 (1876), p. 22.]

These are the crimes upon which Mr. Seward says Burley was surrendered; and therefore, says Mr. Seward, I do not admit your protest, which I believe to be a protest against trying a man for any different crime from that for which he has been surrendered; but the point is now an abstraction, for we do not mean to do so. That is the case of Burley. The case of Caldwell is a lesson to us as to the caution which should be exercised by the Government in these matters. Caldwell was handed over from Canada to the United States in 1871, and was surrendered for forgery. He appealed to the Canadian Government, and through them to the Home Government, upon this ground—that he was going to be tried for a different offence—namely, bribing an officer of Customs. Now, it is quite true that in 1871—I do not know for what reason—possibly because there were then many other matters in controversy with the United States, and it was not thought desirable to add to the number—there is a despatch from the Colonial Office stating that there does not seem to be any ground for interference. Lord Kimberley adds—

> "Her Majesty's Government are further advised that there is nothing in the Convention which would preclude the indictment of the petitioner in the United States for an additional offence which is not enumerated in the Convention, so long as such proceedings were not substituted for proceedings against him on the charge by reason of which he was surrendered."—[*North America*, No. 4 (1876), p. 7.]

What happened? The case is cited in a book which Mr. Fish says is of great authority—"Clark on Extradition"—and, as I say, is a lesson to us of the results of laxity in these matters. Caldwell never was tried for the offence for which he was surrendered, and he was tried for the offence of bribing an officer of Customs. My Lords, I think that the less said about the case of Caldwell the better. This disposes of all the cases which it is necessary to notice.

My Lords, I now come to what the noble Earl (Earl Granville) calls the declarations made by public men upon this subject. I heard what was said in the House of Commons in 1866 by my noble Friend the then Secretary for Foreign Affairs, being myself at that time Attorney General; and I only mention the fact now for the purpose of showing that in 1866, and after the case of Burley had occurred, whatever the construction put upon it, a distinct and clear declaration was made in the face of the country in the other House of Parliament of what the Foreign Office conceived to be the position of the Extradition question as regards the trial for criminal offences. The noble Earl says the words used on that occasion were words used in the heat of debate. Nothing can be more inaccurate. There was no heat of debate. What occurred was this—A Bill was passing through the other House on the subject of Extradition. It was earnestly criticized, and an Amendment was moved requiring that before any person was given up, the country to which he was surrendered should be asked for an assurance that he should not been tried for any other offence except that for which he was surrendered. My noble Friend (the Earl of Derby) objected to that Amendment. We said to the House of Commons—"In the first place, if it is included in the Treaty, it is not necessary to take a pledge from the other country on the subject; and in the second place, as we understand the law, this country would have a right to complain of any other country which, after a prisoner had been surrendered, should try that prisoner for any offence other than that or which he was surrendered." This what my noble Friend said, as the ead of the Foreign Office at that time, nd speaking in his position as Secretary of State—

> "As for the proposal that the French Government should be required to enter into an undertaking that they would not try any person for ny offence other than that for which he had een given up, he thought that that would be a ery feeble protection indeed: for, assuming for e sake of argument that the French could act the manner suggested—and he really begged ardon for assuming it, even for that purpose—he could only say that a Power which could ct in such a manner would not be bound by an ndertaking of the kind proposed."—[3 *Hansard*, xxxiv. 2114.]

Vhat I said as Attorney General was hat—

> "With respect to the latter part of the hon. [ember's Amendment, which required that the erson should not be tried for any offence but hat for which he had been given up, we should ertainly have a well-founded complaint against ny country that demanded a man to be given p for one offence and then proceeded to try and unish him for another."—[*Ibid.* 2122.]

o much, my Lords, for the declaration vhich was made in the face of the Parliament of this country, and acted upon n 1866 in the other House of Parliament, where the Amendment was withrawn in consequence of that declaration. he Papers with regard to Burley and aldwell were not exhibited to Parliament, but this was a declaration made n the face of Parliament, and about which there could be no mistake. The opinion of the late Sir Thomas Henry, vhose loss we all deplore, was clear that he course taken by Her Majesty's Government was the course required by the practice and by the documents in the ase. The next authority the noble Earl Earl Granville) refers to is Mr. Mullens, vho is described by Mr. Fish as the Solicitor General for England. That, of ourse, is a mistake; but at all events Mr. Mullens is a most respectable solicitor. And what is his opinion as to the propriety of trying prisoners for offences other than those for which they were given up? Sir Robert Collier asked him this question—

> "Supposing a man is given up, is it your opinion that he should not be triable for any quite different offence, or that he should only be tried for that offence, and then sent back again, at all events, and not put upon his trial for any other?"

Mr. Mullens replied—

> "I think he should only be triable for the offence named in the Extradition warrant, or for any other offence named in the Treaty arising out of the same facts."

That is a very different thing from what is contended for now. Sir Robert Collier next asked—

> "Assuming this case, that a man has committed murder in this country and afterwards larceny and escapes to France, and that he is sent over here and tried for larceny; and assuming that he is acquitted on that charge, are we to let him go, or are we to try him for murder, as we have him here?"

Mr. Mullens answered—

> "I think we should not let him go, but we should get the consent of the Government which gave him np before we tried him for murder."

Who is the next authority appealed to by the noble Earl? Lord Hammond—of whom I desire to speak with the greatest respect and who was then Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs—came to be examined on the matter, and he appears to have given evidence which was very far indeed from being in favour of the view taken by the noble Earl. Indeed, his evidence was very remarkable. He was asked on the first day of his examination whether he had any recollection of the demands made in respect to trials for different crimes, and he said—

> "I cannot remember any. There was a case, but I do not think that it was a case of murder, connected with the Canadian troubles. A man fled to Canada, and the question was whether the man should be given up; and the further question then arose whether, if he was given up, he should be triable for any other offence. I think that it was ruled that if he was *bonâ fide* tried for the crime for which he was given up he might be tried for another offence afterwards."

Then he was asked—

> "Have you any record or minute of the particulars of this case you are now alluding to?"

He replied—

> "I should think that probably the Law Officers' opinion was taken upon it, but that could not be given to the Committee."

The witness added that he would see whether he could get any particulars of that case. On the second day of his examination Mr. Hammond said the case was that of Burley, and he described, just as I have done this evening, how that case arose. He was asked—

> "Do you mention this case to show that a man can possibly be tried for another offence than that for which he was given up?—I think

the questions led to that point. But does this case decide the point either one way or the other?—No; only that we admit in this country that if a man is *bonâ fide* tried for the offence for which he was given up, there is nothing to prevent his being subsequently tried for another offence, either antecedently committed or not. Did we make any demand upon the American Government after we had learnt that the man had been acquitted upon the first charge?—The man was not actually acquitted, because the jury disagreed and he was held over for trial another time. Then we never made any further inquiry about him?—No."

Mr. Hammond also said it would be very troublesome, if, supposing a man were given up under an Extradition Treaty, we were to instruct our Minister at the Court of the country to which he was given up to keep his eye upon the case and to ascertain what became of the man. And then came this remarkable answer, which I suppose expresses Lord Hammond's own opinion on the subject. After remarking that there is nothing in our Treaties to prevent a man being given up even for political offences, he said—

> "In dealing with foreign nations, we can only go by our Treaty relations. If you ask me what is my own feeling on the subject, I should say it would be a great breach of faith and morality on the part of a foreign Government if, after having tried a man for the offence for which he was given up and having failed in convicting him of that offence, they should then put him upon his trial for a political offence, knowing well that if we had been aware that there was a political offence in the background we should never have given him up."

Let me, now, substitute for "political offence" any offence which is not the subject of extradition. Would not a foreign Government know perfectly well that if we had been asked to give up a man for another offence we should not have done so, and does not Lord Hammond's reasoning, therefore, apply just as much to such an offence as it does to a political offence?

I have, I trust, satisfied your Lordships that on the general principles of Extradition and on the wording of our Treaty, of the Act of Parliament of 1843 and of the American warrant the course laid down for the Government was a clear and distinct one, and that we could not have taken any other course. And now let me say a few words about political offences. In the Treaty with the United States of America there is not a word about political offences. If the noble Earl's construction be the right one, and if a person handed over can be tried for any other offence besides that for which he was handed over, there is nothing in the Treaty which prevents his being tried for a political offence. I heard with great interest and some surprise the argument of the noble Earl (Earl Grey) on this subject the other night. The noble Earl was very bold indeed. He said people in this country are far too thin-skinned in regard to political offences — that political offences were very serious things, and that the men who committed them ought to be given up just like other offenders. Further the noble Earl said that if this were not the view of the people of this country they ought to be taught not to regard political offences as they do now. I know the boldness of the noble Earl, and I am sure that if any one is competent to instruct public opinion on this subject it is himself. But I do not wish him to be successful, and I should be very much surprised if he were successful. I believe the people of England have perfectly made up their mind on this subject. I believe they will not consent to deliver up persons for political offences. Whatever may be the form of Treaty or Act of Parliament, they will take care that no persons are delivered up for political offences. But if the construction contended for by the United States and by the noble Earl be correct, we have no security whatever against the surrender of political offenders under this Treaty. If it is in the power of another country, after trying a prisoner for the offence for which he was surrendered, to try him for another offence, that other offence might involve political considerations. There are two principles which are perfectly clear. The first is, that no man shall be surrendered for a political offence; the other is, that this country itself shall be the judge whether an offence is political or not. Even inside of our own country differences of opinion on that point constantly arise, and some persons think an offence is political which others do not regard as such. This is, at all events, a point which we will not leave to the judgment of another country—we must judge of it ourselves, and we cannot do so unless we know what is the offence or what are the offences for which the surrendered criminal is to be tried. My Lords, what security did the Minister of the United States wish for in this matter? Mr. Fish says that he never desired to have a criminal

rendered for a political offence; but
the very same despatch in which he
ys so he tells us that as to all offences
ainst the law of the States, as distin-
ished from Federal offences, the Go-
rnment of the United States—with
hich observe alone we have the power
communicating—is powerless. They
annot control the prosecution in such
ses; they cannot order it be suspended
nay, more, if a man be convicted the
resident of the United States cannot
rdon him. The security of which Mr.
sh speaks is, therefore, no security at
. But I would appeal from Mr. Fish
President Tyler, who says, in effect—
Here is the Article in the Treaty;
an it over. In the careful enumera-
on of crimes which you see there the
ject has been to exclude all political
fences."

I wish, in the next place, my Lords,
say a word as to a misapprehension
hich has arisen with respect to the Act
1870. I have not up to this moment
id a word about that Act; but I must
ow venture to correct what fell from the
ble Earl who brought forward this
bject on that point. The noble Earl
id that we at first relied upon the Act
1870, and that then we gave it up.
ut we have not given it up; and I wish
to be distinctly understood, so far as
e Government are concerned, that we
e disposed to agree entirely with the
ew of the United States Government,
at an Act of Parliament passed in this
untry in 1870 cannot alter the terms
a Treaty made in 1842. But the Act
ight, whether by oversight or not,
ave imposed shackles and impediments
n the Executive of a country in dealing
ith a prisoner whose surrender was
emanded. Whether it has that effect
r not it is difficult to say, because that
epends upon the construction of a clause
hich I am bound to tell your Lordships
onestly, after the best consideration I
uld give it, is absolutely and utterly
nintelligible to my mind. I may add
at upon the only occasion when it came
nder the notice of one of our Courts of
aw—the Court of Queen's Bench—all
e Judges of that Court said they
hought it was very doubtful what the
ct meant, and recommended that it
hould on the earliest possible occasion
e set right by the Legislature. It im-
oses in its present shape upon any
overnment a very great difficulty; be-
ause if a Government were to hand over a prisoner without taking those assurances which the Act requires, he might, for all I know, obtain his *Habeas Corpus* and be set at liberty. That is the purpose for which we referred to the Act of 1870. It is quite immaterial as regards the broader and higher ground of what our obligations are under the document of 1842.

I will now say a word as to the policy of raising this question, as the Government have felt themselves obliged to raise it at the present time. The noble Earl (Earl Granville) said the other night that if we had let things go on, the great probability was that Lawrence would never have been tried for any other offence than that for which he was surrendered, and that we ought to have waited for some other occasion when if it were attempted to try a prisoner for a different offence we might have objected to the adoption of such a course. Well, it was, no doubt, open to the Government to act in that way; but I think I can show your Lordships that we were entirely justified in acting as we have done. Lawrence was in the United States handed over on a charge of forgery. There was an indictment found against him for some offence—I think against the Revenue Laws—which was not the subject of Extradition. There was, therefore, a distinct and clear announcement on the part of the United States that it was intended to proceed against Lawrence for the two offences. Now, we were able to say that although we could not agree with the Government of the United States in the construction which they put upon the Treaty, we believed them to be perfectly sincere in contending that that was the view which they had always entertained, and that although we differed from them, we were not prepared to make any serious demand upon them with regard to Lawrence. But how, my Lords, would the matter stand on another occasion? Suppose we had gone on surrendering prisoner after prisoner to the United States, and that on some other occasion—perhaps with regard to some offence which excited more interest in this country—the United States had pursued the same course, and proposed to try a criminal for a different offence from that for which he had been surrendered. Suppose the demand then made which has been made now; the United States Government would turn round and say to us—

"You knew perfectly well what our view of the Treaty was. We told you months ago, and with full notice you have gone on surrendering prisoners; we had, therefore, a right to assume that you were satisfied with the attitude which we had taken in the matter." Now, my Lords, if there be one course more than another which would be likely to land us in complications and embarrassments it would be to leave open a sore of that kind to be dealt with on some future occasion in the case of some criminal with regard to whom a greater amount of public interest might have been aroused. I should very much deprecate the discussion of a question of this importance with reference to the merits or demerits of any particular person whose surrender might be asked for by the United States. The noble Earl spoke the other night of those men as murderers, robbers, and rogues—and for all I know they may be what he describes them to be, although the tenderness of our law assumes that a person is innocent until he is proved to be guilty. But be that as it may, I can conceive nothing more dangerous than to bring down a great and important principle to the level of the merits or demerits of the individual in whose case that principle is brought in question. That is not the way in which we act in this country with regard to our criminal law, on the great principles of which and on the cardinal rules of evidence we all depend for our lives and liberties. If in a particular case we were to overstrain or overthrow those great principles and those rules, the evil which we would have done would be sure to come back upon us in some great political prosecution, or some trial of a man against whom an unjust and violent prejudice happened to have arisen in the public mind. So it is with regard to this question of Extradition. There are some words which fell on the subject from a great master of history which are the words not only of a historian, but of a philosopher, and which I should like to read to your Lordships. He says—

> "We are ever too ready, when it is the redress of our own injuries that is in question, to strain and compromise those general laws to which we have all to look for protection in the time of our adversity; and thus, when the day of trial comes, we find those laws no longer in existence."

These are words of warning which I think we should do well to lay to our hearts at a time when there is lit
political excitement. I have now la
before your Lordships as concisely as
could the principles on which the G
vernment has acted; and I mainta
that the obligations under which
acted not only justify the conduct whi
has been pursued, but rendered a
other course of conduct absolutely i
possible.

Lord SELBORNE: My Lords, the
are some points about which there w
be universal agreement, and one is th
it is our duty to discuss this questi
with the most perfect dispassionatene
with the greatest possible desire to
fair and candid, and certainly with t
remembrance that no triumph of me
ingenious argument, even though
might be successful for a time, could co
pensate for the mischief that might
done by the possible unsoundness
that argument. Your Lordships mu
have observed that my noble Frie
who introduced this subject (Earl Gra
ville) was careful to do so in a tone
manner which could not possibly bear t
construction of a Party attack or in
cate a desire to magnify the errors—
errors there were—of Her Majesty
Government. I desire to imitate m
noble Friend in that respect; and at t
outset I have to make three ackno
ledgments to Her Majesty's Gover
ment, and so far to place the correctne
or incorrectness of the course they ha
pursued beyond the possible limits o
Party attack. First, it is undoubted
true, as has been stated by the nob
and learned Lord on the Woolsack, th
when this question came incidenta
under discussion in the other House
1866, both the noble Earl opposite (t
Earl of Derby), then and now Foreig
Secretary, and my noble and learn
Friend on the Woolsack expressed view
the full effect of which, as now explain
by them, may possibly not have be
obvious to all who heard them, b
views entirely consistent with the arg
ments on which they now rely, and,
have no doubt whatever, intended
them at that time in a sense substa
tially the same with the opinions th
now express. Whether they are right
wrong in the view they take of the oblig
tions of this country under the Treaty
1842, no one is fairly entitled to call
question the consistency of their prese
and former opinions, or to deny that th
were justified, whatever might be t

different views taken by others, in acting upon the opinions which they expressed in 1866. The next point to be borne in mind in favour of the Government is this—although undoubtedly the Act of 1870 could not alter the provisions of the Treaty, which it professed to respect and keep alive, and must, I think, be supposed to have intended to do so; on the other hand, so far as the future policy of this country is concerned, the Act of 1870 did, in substance—as to the precise extent there is something to be said — point out to those who might afterwards have the negotiation of any Extradition Treaties on behalf of this country a line of policy in accordance with that now followed by Her Majesty's Government. Therefore, they were not only justified, but—so far as general policy is concerned, so far as any action intended to be independent of the Treaty of 1842 is concerned—they were more than justified in acting upon the views and principles which Parliament had laid down as the general rule for the future. The third concession I desire to make to Her Majesty's Government—and it is really very important with reference to the position of this country—is that the Treaty of 1842 being terminable by either party at will and without notice, no question of a breach of international faith could fairly be raised, even if Her Majesty's Government were wrong in the construction which they put upon that Treaty, when they gave notice of what their construction was, in what sense they understood their obligation, and that they should not act upon the Treaty in any other sense. In form, no doubt, that was not a declaration of their choice and will to put an end to the Treaty; but, having the power to do so without previous notice, it is manifest that an intimation of that sort was to all intents and purposes equivalent to a conditional declaration of an intention to put an end to it if there were continued difference of opinion as to its construction. In that state of things, I think no question of good faith as between nation and nation can be involved in the course Her Majesty's Government have taken, even if they have been wrong in the view they have taken of their obligation. I must now take exception to two expressions used by my noble and learned Friend. He spoke more than once of my noble Friend (Earl Granville) having adopted the argument of the United States. It may be that the view we take is the same with that which has been taken by the United States; but I protest against it being said that we adopt the arguments of the United States. The arguments are our own, the interpretation that of two Governments to which my noble Friend has belonged, and that for which I myself am responsible as the principal Law Adviser of the Crown in 1865. It is our own view, our own interpretation, which we are justifying, and not the argument of the United States, and I venture to think we do not go too far in asserting that, until the accession to office of the present Administration, it was the view of the British Government. We may have been wrong, but believe ourselves to have been right; and, having acted *bonâ fide* when former Governments took steps founded on our view, we had no option but to defend our own course, our own action, and our own opinions, although they happened to be the same as those of the United States. The other expression of my noble and learned Friend, to which I take exception, was that in which he stated it to be our construction of the Treaty, that the country to which extradition was made was at liberty to try for any other offence, provided it "goes through the form" of trying for the first offence. My noble and learned Friend will excuse me saying that this was a piece of rhetoric hardly characterized by his usual candour, because throughout the Papers which express the views formerly taken by our Government and throughout the arguments, it has always been said there must be a *bonâ fide* trial upon the charge on which the man was delivered up; that being the test of the *bona fides* of the requisition; because, if he were not tried at all for the offence for which he was asked to be surrendered, it might be strong evidence that there was an indirect purpose in asking for the surrender on particular grounds. Therefore a *bonâ fide* trial for that particular offence has always been regarded on our side as involved naturally in the demand for extradition. I will now follow my noble and learned Friend in his arguments. I confess it was with some surprise that I heard him endeavour to lay the foundation for everything which was to follow —not in the terms of the Treaty between the two Powers, but in some vague notion of *à priori* comity leading to a law of Extradition independent of Treaty, and importing silent clauses and expressions of jurists, on which he laid much stress. These arguments do not seem to have been thought good enough to be worth producing in the Correspondence laid on the Table; and the able despatch in which the arguments of Her Majesty's Government are summed up, so far from parading the opinions of jurists and text-writers, disputes the propriety of introducing them. But if the argument developed from those writers had any really legitimate bearing on the question, it is not conceivable that my noble and learned Friend or the Law Advisers of the Crown would not have discovered the passages he has just quoted in time for them to do duty not merely in your Lordships' House, but in the important Correspondence with the United States Government. My Lords, I confess that for my part I have not been persuaded by my noble and learned Friend's able speech to accept the views of those writers as in any degree affording a solution of this question. There is no such thing—certainly there never has been such a thing recognized in or by this country—as an *à priori* international obligation to grant extradition at all. That depends with us entirely on Treaties. The terms of those Treaties must contain in themselves the whole measure of the obligation as between country and country. I am fully aware that even in the United States there have been great writers—at least as great as any of those quoted by my noble and learned Friend—who have advocated the doctrine that there is a certain *à priori* right to demand extradition. But my noble and learned Friend did not refer to them, because he would not find in them anything in support of the view that it is an implied condition of extradition that a man should be tried only for the crime on which he has been surrendered. The real truth is, all the writers to whom my noble and learned Friend referred do but generalize from the laws of their own countries or particular Treaties of their own or other countries which they collect in their books. That is more especially the case of Fælix with regard to France. Now, as to the law of France, my noble and learned Friend stated very truly that in 1841 the Minister of Justice laid it down as a rule that a man was not to be tried for any offence but that on which he was given up, and he referred in illustration of that principle to a case which occurred between France and Geneva. But what is the bearing of all that on the question now before us, except that another great and civilized country has taken the same view, not of law, but of policy, which was taken by the British Parliament in the year 1870? In France extradition depends, not on law, but entirely on the absolute despotic action of the Government. The Executive Government of France in 1841 laid down for its own guidance and the guidance of its Executive officers the same rule which was afterwards laid down by the Legislature of this country in the Act of 1870. How that bears upon our engagement of 1842 with the United States passes my comprehension. I will not, therefore, detain your Lordships long on that point. Not only, my Lords, does the Executive Government in France possess absolute power with respect to extradition, but the Cour de Cassation in 1867, at the instance of M. Baroche, the then Minister of Justice, decided that the French Courts had nothing to do with the rule laid down in the Circular referred to; and I believe the Minister of Justice in that year did actually cause a man to be tried for an offence other than that on which he had been surrendered, and established his right to do so before the Cour de Cassation. I ought to apologize to your Lordships for having said even so much as this on the subject of the law and practice of France; because the question is not as to the law and practice of France, but as to the Treaty between this country and the United States. My noble and learned Friend said he did not know of any authority who expressed views different from those entertained by Her Majesty's Government. My Lords, we have a writer of very great learning who has collected a body of International Law with perhaps more fulness than most others—a writer, I believe, to whom foreign jurists look with considerable respect—I mean Sir Robert Phillimore. I do not think my noble and learned Friend would find it laid down in Sir Robert Phillimore's book as a principle of International Law with respect to Extradition, that a man should not be tried for any offence but that on which he has been surrendered, though I believe he would find it to be there stated as a recognized principle of international usage that an extradited person should not be tried for a political offence. Now I come to what governs the whole matter—namely, the Treaty of 1842. My noble and learned Friend asked, if a man could be tried for any other offence than that on which he had been surrendered, why were certain crimes specified in the Treaty, and a provision laid down that there should be *primâ facie* evidence according to British law that he was guilty of one of them? My noble and learned Friend noticed that that list of offences did not include embezzlement, manslaughter, rape, and abduction, and he challenged us to say why there should be that selection. He thought it was not a sufficient reason to say that this was done to provide against arbitrary arrests, and then he went on to state his own view. Well, my answer is, that the specification of offences is made because it is not consistent with the principle of Extradition that a person should be given up, except for a crime which has a common character in both countries. For that reason the practice has been to specify offences as to which the jurisprudence of both countries is understood to agree, and as to the meaning of which, therefore, there should be no ambiguity. It is perfectly true that the specification of offences does not go as far as it might do; but it goes as far as, at the time of negotiating the Treaty between the two parties, it was thought necessary or convenient to go, in the direction of ascertaining what are the graver offences which have a common designation and a common meaning under the laws of both countries. Then my noble and learned Friend went on to ask, why does the Treaty require *primâ facie* evidence in the first instance, according to English law, as to the guilt of the man in respect to the crime for which his surrender is asked? Plainly because the crime is specified—because the same principles in both countries apply to it, though each country may have its own particular method of dealing with it. That provision as to *primâ facie* evidence cannot mean that British law is to govern for any other purpose than for that of determining the sufficiency of the case for giving up the man to American justice. When he gets to America he must, of course, be tried, not by British, but by American law, and according to American rules of evidence, and if found guilty must undergo the punishment which American law provides. The sole purpose of applying the test of British law in this country is that before we give the man up we should have *primâ facie* evidence that he is guilty of one of the crimes specified in the Treaty of Extradition. We give him up, then, because we have confidence in the justice of the country which claims him; and if the conditions on which we give him up are fulfilled, I am utterly at a loss to understand why he should not afterwards be tried for any offence whatever—other than political—for which American law can try him. Let us look at the abstract question from the common sense point of view:—and it is very material to do so when we are asked to interpolate what my noble and learned Friend calls "a silent clause," not expressed, as is admitted, in the Treaty. Of course if the *à priori* reason were so plain, so manifest, that no two sensible persons could differ about it, then I could understand the argument as to interpolating a silent clause. But that is not the case. I hope that many of your Lordships now present heard the speech made by the Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas when this question was last before the House. Putting political offences aside, he appeared to me to show, in the most convincing manner, how contrary to the true spirit of international justice it would be to fetter the demands of that justice by requiring that a man should be tried only for the precise offence for which he was given up. If you really place confidence in the justice of the country with which you make the Treaty, what possible interest can the country which delivers a man up have in sheltering him from trial and punishment for any crime that he has committed? Have you any engagement with him to shelter him in that way? Certainly not. Your only engagement is that which you have with the country with which you have made the Treaty. Are you to assume that he will be fairly tried for the crime for which you have surrendered him, but that he would not be fairly tried for any other? Surely not. The mode of examining, the mode of trial, the law of evidence, and the consequences of the crime may differ entirely in the two countries; yet he is sent to be tried according to the law of the country to which he is given up, not according to ours. But it is said that if he is acquitted the inference then is that if the facts which come out in evidence had been brought before the magistrate of the country which surrenders him he would not have been surrendered, and the country to which he is sent would avail themselves of their own wrong if they tried him for another offence. That, however, is an argument which puts aside the substance in dealing with the form of the matter. Take the case of murder and manslaughter. Murder is the greater, manslaughter the less offence. I rather think that by our present law, even if the indictment brought against a man is for murder alone, he may be found guilty of manslaughter upon the very same evidence, because the latter offence is less than the former, and the jury may take a merciful view of the facts. Can it be said that this country has an interest in protecting a man who has been delivered up for murder from being convicted for manslaughter, when under a more merciful view of the evidence adduced to convict him of murder the offence may be reduced to the lower crime? Surely if the man is handed over by us on sufficient grounds we have no interest in fettering the action of justice. Take the case of extradition crimes only. Supposing a man is accused in America of all the seven offences mentioned in the Treaty, would you actually impose on the United States the burden of sending over to England all the voluminous proofs of every one of the various offences of which it might be necessary to accuse him? And all this not because it is supposed that they have some sinister end in view, or a desire to do that particular man some wrong, but because you say it is our right that he shall not be convicted of any offence other than that as to which we have seen the evidence. If the case of political offenders were put out of sight, surely it would be conducive to the interests and the objects sought by all Extradition Treaties that where sufficient evidence is produced to justify the surrender of a criminal, he should be tried in the country to which he goes upon any criminal charge that might be brought against him. That view is, I hold, at all events not so manifestly wrong or unreasonable that you should introduce a silent condition which is not expressed in this particular Treaty, for the purpose of excluding it. The Treaty is as far as anything in the world can be from implying any such thing. It says, the two countries agree that on mutual requisitions made by them or their Ministers they will respectively deliver up to justice all persons who, being charged with any one of the specified offences committed in the jurisdiction of the other, shall seek an asylum in the territories of the other. The noble Earl the Foreign Secretary held that the person surrendered was only lent to the foreign Government for the purposes of that surrender, to be tried for the particular offence. The persons who negotiated the Treaty of 1842 and the Minister who introduced the Act of 1843 were utterly ignorant of that theory. Nay, more, a contrary theory was distinctly expressed and recognized in the debates on that occasion, although the only question that was then seriously discussed was the bearing of the Treaty on the subject of slavery. With your Lordships' permission, I will trouble you with a few extracts from the debates in the House of Commons when the Act of 1843 was under discussion. Referring to the case of a slave who had come within our jurisdiction, Mr. Vernon Smith said—

"Supposing he was really guilty of some crime, was he, when taken back, to be treated as a slave or a freeman? The conditions of trial were very different, and so were the punishments of slaves and freemen. In the case likewise of a slave committed by a magistrate unjustly (and he supposed magistrates in the Colonies were not wiser than anywhere else), and afterwards acquitted, what became of him? All the vindictive feelings of the owner might be exasperated against him on account of his flight, and he might be inclined to wreak his vengeance upon him when thus restored to his possession." —[3 *Hansard*, lxxi. 564.]

Was that met by the Attorney General of that day by the argument that the man was only lent to the United States to be tried for the particular crime for which he had been given up, and that if he was acquitted there was an implied condition that he should have an opportunity of returning to our jurisdiction? Sir Frederick Pollock, the Attorney General, then answered—

"We had nothing whatever to do with the circumstances of the person delivered up being a slave or a freeman. We should deliver him up as a criminal. . . All that we insist upon is that before any man shall be delivered up to the Americans he shall be charged with one of the crimes mentioned in the Treaty. If that were done we did not care whether the man had been a slave or not. . . The magistrates would have to deal with a man charged with having committed an offence in a foreign State, and his status in that State had nothing to do with the case. That was a point to be settled on the man's return to America."—[*Ibid.* 566.]

Lord Macaulay was not satisfied with that answer. He thought it made matters worse, and he would rather give up the Bill; and he asked—

> "Suppose the man was acquitted in America, what was to be done with him then? Was he to remain a slave in the hands of a master incensed by the attempt to run away? Would the slave's life in such a case be safe, even after his acquittal?"—[*Ibid.* 571.]

The late Lord Derby, then Lord Stanley, replied to that thus—

> "No doubt it was possible that persons, whether guilty or not, if sent back to a country where slavery prevailed, might be returned to a state of slavery."—[*Ibid.* 577.]

That was the language of the Lord Stanley of that day, and there was no man in this country who was more opposed to slavery, or who would have been more ready to take any proper steps to rescue a man from slavery than he was. I have referred to these passages to show that the idea that a man was only lent to the foreign State, to be tried for the offence for which he was surrendered under the Treaty of Extradition, was not then entertained by the British Government. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack laid great stress on the words, which are undoubtedly found in the Act of 1843, though not in the Treaty, to the effect that a man should be surrendered "to be tried for the crime of which he was accused." The noble and learned Lord insisted, that this affirmative implied the negation of everything else: and he endeavoured to fortify that conclusion by several illustrations;—such as, that a man cannot be tried in one county under a warrant directed to another county, and that trust funds cannot be invested in one security when it is directed that they shall be invested in another. Illustrations of that kind have no application whatever to the present question. It is true that a man cannot be tried in one county under a warrant directed to another county; but that does not prohibit a second warrant directed to another county from being issued by any competent authority: and it is not because trust funds are directed to be invested in a particular class of security that a subsequent order may not be made directing them to be invested in other securities. The authority of the English Act of Parliament, of course, goes no further than the particular purpose expressed in it; and that authority is spent and exhausted, when the man has passed beyond British jurisdiction. Another authority, that of the State into whose jurisdiction he passes, then comes in; and, unless that State has agreed by Treaty to make a particular and limited use of that authority, it cannot be bound by any negative inferences from the terms of an English statute; which, indeed, are inferences not drawn by the Courts of the United States from the exactly similar terms of their own Act of Congress. There is, therefore, no analogy at all between those cases and the point now at issue. What can such cases have to do with the power of a country to whose justice a man has been surrendered to try him for any offence he may have committed according to their own law? I therefore demur entirely to the proposition that because an English Act of Parliament and an American Act of Congress state that a man is to be delivered up to be tried for a particular offence, therefore he cannot be tried for any other. To show that in trying him for any other offence a breach of faith under the terms of the Treaty would be committed, we must do something more than put forward words contained in the English Act of Parliament. In my opinion, we ought to treat with some respect the construction which has been put, not only on their own Act of Congress, but also upon the Treaty, by the American Courts of Justice. In the United States, Treaties confirmed by the Senate are law, without any Act of Congress, and are proper subjects of judicial interpretation. The words to which the noble and learned Lord refers have been the subject of judicial interpretation in the American Courts, as appears from the Papers; and these Courts, having before them the terms of the British and American Acts, of the Treaty, and of the warrants, have held that the language used in them does not bear the construction the noble and learned Lord seeks to put upon it: and the same view has also been taken by the Canadian Courts. But the matter does not stand there; because if these words in the Act of 1843 have the force and the importance which the noble and learned Lord attributes to them, how is it that they were omitted in the Act, otherwise similar, which was passed to carry into effect the Extradition Treaty with Denmark in 1856? The next step brings us to a matter to which the noble and learned Lord made no reference whatever, but the importance of which was pointed out by the noble Lord near me (Lord Hammond). I refer to the terms of the Convention made with France in 1853. Those terms showed that there was then no objection whatever on the part of the British Government to a man being tried for any Extradition crime other than that for which he had been surrendered, after he might have been tried and acquitted of the offence for which he had been delivered up. The words of the 7th section of the Convention are—

> "No accused or convicted person who may be surrendered shall, in any case, be proceeded against or punished on account of any political offence committed prior to his being surrendered, nor for any offence or crime not described in the present Convention, which he may have committed previously to being surrendered."—[*Hertslet*, ix., 281.]

On which Mr. Clark, in his book on Extradition, observes—

> "It will be observed that under this Convention a person who has been surrendered could have been tried for other offences than that for which his rendition had been granted, provided that such offences were not political and were within the list of crimes contained in the Convention."

It will be remembered that at that period Parliament was very jealous of any concession on this subject being made to France—a circumstance which made it very difficult to arrive at any agreement on the question of Extradition. The Convention failed, but on other grounds than the terms of the section which I have just read to your Lordships, and I merely refer to them to show what was the understanding of the British Government on the point at that time. I now come to the case of Burley, in which the British Government had every possible motive for raising in favour of the prisoner the point now taken by the noble and learned Lord. At this distance of time I am not committing any indiscretion in stating to your Lordships the views which were then held by the British Government with reference to that case. Burley was a commissioned officer of the Confederate States, who, with assistance from sympathizers in the British Provinces, manned a vessel to carry on warlike operations on the Lakes: and he made an attack, involving the capture of goods and danger to life, on Johnson's Island, a part of the United States, to which the war had not, up to that time, penetrated. For these Acts, he was charged in Canada under the Extradition Treaty with robbery and with assault with intent to commit murder. The Canadian Judges held that they were bound to surrender him on the charge of robbery. The Home Government, however, did not approve the decision of the Canadian Judges, considering the evidence to prove that the acts done were political and belligerent, and not civil offences. They thought that the man ought not to have been surrendered; and, moreover, they were afraid that he would be treated as a political offender. They, therefore, would have been most anxious to raise the point that the man could only be tried for the offence for which he had been surrendered, had they felt that the terms of the Treaty would have enabled them to do so. It was my duty as one of the Law Officers of the Crown to advise the Government on the matter; both I and my Colleagues were satisfied that the Treaty would not bear the interpretation the noble and learned Lord now desires to put upon it, and we came to the conclusion, that the Government could not interfere in the matter, if Burley was *bonâ fide* put on his trial for the crime of robbery, for which he had been surrendered. The Secretary of State acted accordingly. I do not mean my noble Friend (Viscount Cardwell), who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies, and who does not seem to me, from the Papers, to have had occasion to form or express an official opinion of his own on that point; but the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. And the fact is, that Burley was tried, not only for the crime of robbery, for which alone he had been surrendered, but also for that of assault with intent to commit murder, as to which the Canadian magistrates had thought the evidence insufficient to justify his surrender on that ground. This case, therefore, was beyond all doubt an instance in which the British Government directly acted upon an interpretation of the Treaty directly the contrary to that of the noble and learned Lord. My noble and learned Friend says that in 1866 his opinion had been stated in Parliament. True; but in 1868, before the Committee of the House of Commons, evidence was given as to the view which the Foreign Office then took, and upon which it had acted, and this evidence was laid before Parliament and published to the world. The result of the Committee's deliberation was strongly against the view now taken by Her Majesty's Government. The Committee did not say—"We find the existing Treaty, in accordance with the view of all civilized nations, has a tacit clause which provides that a man when surrendered shall only be tried for the offence on which he has been surrendered;" but they proposed that in future Treaties there should be an express agreement to that effect. This is strong evidence that the Committee did not think it was already provided for in all the Treaties. It is clear, too, that this understanding was not then confined to the Foreign Office; for Mr. Mullens, to whom Sir Thomas Henry referred as the solicitor who knew most upon the subject, also gave evidence of the existing understanding. Mr. Stuart Mill asked this question:—

> "As I understand it, the Treaty with America will not prevent a man from being tried for another offence?"

And the answer of Mr. Mullens was—

> "It will not. There in no stipulation that he shall not be tried for any other offence."

It is clear that, according to the whole evidence, no such obligation was then supposed to exist, without being expressed; and accordingly the Committee recommended that it should be expressed in all future engagements. The third Clause of the Act of 1870, therefore, provides that future arrangements for extradition to any foreign State shall not be capable of becoming law by virtue of Orders in Council—I will read the words, to which sufficient attention has hardly been given—

> "Unless provision is made by the law of that State or by arrangement that the fugitive criminal shall not, until he has been restored or had an opportunity of returning to Her Majesty's dominions, be detained or tried in that foreign State for any offence committed prior to his surrender other than the extradition crime proved by the facts on which the surrender is grounded."

And the corresponding Clause 19, expressing the obligation which we took upon ourselves, is in these words—

> "Where, in pursuance of any arrangement with a foreign State, any person accused or convicted of any crime which, if committed in England, would be one of the crimes described in the first schedule to this Act, is surrendered by that foreign State, such person shall not, until he has been restored or had an opportunity of returning to such foreign State, be triable or tried for any offence committed prior to the surrender in any part of Her Majesty's dominions, other than such of the said crimes as may be proved by the facts on which the surrender is grounded."

It appears highly probable that, even in this country, a man might now be tried under an Extradition Treaty negotiated since 1870 for a different crime from that upon which he had been given up, provided it was one of the crimes enumerated in the Act of 1870, and provided it was proved by the facts on which the surrender was grounded. For example: the same evidence of facts might prove both robbery and murder—if so, though the criminal had been demanded for the robbery only, he might be tried also for the murder, or *vice versâ*. A further and material part of the case is contained in the last section of the Act of 1870, which provides that—

> "This Act, with the exception of anything contained in it which is inconsistent with the Treaties referred to in the repealed Acts"—that is, the American, the French, and the Danish Treaties—"shall apply for the purpose of the execution of those Treaties."

Now, the Legislature must have meant something by this clause. "Inconsistent with the existing Treaties?" But, according to the argument of my noble and learned Friend, there was nothing in the Act inconsistent with any of the existing Treaties. Why, then, was this clause inserted? According to our view, they were new conditions; and to apply them, retrospectively, to the existing Treaties, would have been inconsistent with those Treaties. But, if these conditions were really in the existing Treaties, then the exception introduced into the Act was perfectly idle and useless. This appears to be strong evidence that Parliament knew it was laying down a new law and was imposing new conditions for the future. It knew that these conditions could not be imported into existing Treaties; it did not wish that those Treaties should be put an end to; but it provided new machinery, which was capable of being applied, and which it intended to be applied, for the purpose of executing those Treaties; and, in point of fact, there has never been the smallest difficulty in applying, for the purpose of the surrender of criminals under the Treaty of 1842, the judicial machinery of the Act of 1870. It is rather singular that my noble and learned Friend should have taken no notice of the Note in Mr. E. Clark's book on Bouvier's Case. Mr. Clark is a lawyer of considerable experience, who has been engaged in several of these Extradition cases, and in his book is collected the whole history of Extradition. His Note is as follows:—

> "It is curious that this point has not yet been raised in any case under the American Treaty. It is quite clear that neither that Treaty nor the law of the United States contains the provision required by the Extradition Act, 1870. The question is a very important one, and deserves to be fully argued. Nor can the case of Bouvier be accepted as conclusive, even with regard to France. The point may be raised again upon more satisfactory affidavits as to the law of France than were before the Court in that case."

To Mr. Clark, therefore, it seemed clear that this was a new rule in the Act of 1870, and that no such condition was expressed, or implied, in the existing Treaties. Those who advised the Government in a different sense from that of the argument of my noble and learned Friend were certainly justified in that advice upon every principle applicable to the construction of written instruments; and but for the political argument as to political offenders, I should say with confidence that the common sense of the matter is also entirely against the view of the noble and learned Lord. But I admit there is a good deal to be said in favour of the argument as it bears on the case of political offenders. I admit, fully and freely, that the rule which is laid down in the Act of 1870 is the only one which provides absolute security against the possible case of a man, surrendered for an extradition crime, being afterwards tried for a political offence. This may or may not be a sufficient reason for adhering to the policy of the Act of 1870. It may or may not be a sufficient reason for doing that which the Legislature was not prepared to urge upon the Government in 1870—namely, put an end to the American, French, and Danish Treaties. But it cannot have the effect of interpolating into those Treaties, by reason of that ulterior consequence, conditions which are not there. Nor, indeed, as far as the understanding of the two countries, between which the present question has arisen, is concerned, was it necessary to do so; because the United States admit as fully as we do, not that there is in the terms of the Treaty an implied exception as regards political offenders, but that by the understanding, common to them and ourselves, and to most, if not all, other civilized nations, such offenders ought not to be put upon their trial for a political, after extradition for a civil, offence. I must say that if ever there was a nation which was entitled to confidence in this respect, it is the United States. I do not know of anything much nobler than the conduct of the United States towards the citizens with whom they had been in deadly conflict, after the suppression of the Civil War. Men whom in their disputes with us they branded over and over again as pirates and everything else that was bad, were, on coming into their own power, recognized as political offenders, who had simply tried by force of arms to alter the constitution of their country. There never was an instance of equal leniency under such circumstances. Moreover, that leniency does not stand alone. The facts relating to the case of Burley strongly tend to justify confidence in the United States on this subject. He was put upon his trial for robbery, and also for assault with intent to commit murder; and the facts on which he had been surrendered being proved, the Judge in the United States pointed out that the complexion of the case was really political, and he summed up decidedly for an acquittal. It is true the jury did not agree upon their verdict, but the man had the benefit of the doubt, and was not convicted. I think he was put on his trial a second time, but the result was the same. It was impossible to eliminate the political element from the case, and consequently he was not convicted. I would here remind your Lordships of the remark which Lord Aberdeen made in 1843. He said—

> "The great security was the provision that this part of the Treaty should continue in force only till one or other of the two Governments

signified its intention to terminate it, so that, whenever inconveniences arose, either Government was at liberty to put an end to that part of the Treaty without being under the necessity of giving any notice beforehand."—[3 *Hansard*, lxxi. 564.]

It is plain that Lord Aberdeen would have followed the course which the noble Earl opposite was first disposed to take, until another view, which he at last accepted, was pressed upon him by another Department of the Government. I myself very much agree with a passage which I find in a letter from Mr. Fish, under date the 22nd of May, 1876, in these Papers. Mr. Fish says—

> "The rights of society and the duties of the State in the punishment of criminals should not be narrowed and unduly restricted, upon the vague suggestions or fear that, at some time, some political criminal may be placed in jeopardy. The duty of Government to protect its own citizens and punish crime is equally a duty with that of affording hospitality and shelter to political offenders from abroad. The Government of the United States sees no reason why either should be sacrificed to the other, any more than why all criminals should escape, for fear some political offender may suffer."—[*N.A.* No. 2 (1876) p. 6.]

Again, I find in a letter written by the late Sir Thomas Henry on the 4th of January last the following passage, which also appears to me to have an important practical bearing on this point:—

> "After an experience of upwards of 30 years, I can say that I have never known a single instance in which there was any occasion to consider whether there was anything of a political character in the offence charged; and I therefore think there is no cause for the least alarm upon that ground. Extradition Treaties are in the nature of Mercantile Treaties, and are intended to afford protection chiefly against dishonest clerks and fraudulent bankrupts."—[*N.A.* No. 1 (1876) p. 45.]

The present question has reference to no other nations which have Extradition Treaties with us, but only to the United States. They are perfectly willing to enter into the strictest engagements to try no man for a political offence who is surrendered under the Treaty; and I think it would be greatly to be deplored if negotiations which had so nearly reached a practical end before this difference between the two countries arose should now be made more difficult in their further progress. Her Majesty's Government have, on account of that difference, taken a course which is, in my view, equivalent to a notice to put an end to the Treaty of 1842; and the question now is, what modification is possible of its terms. Any conceivable modification would be better than that there should be a permanent cessation of a Treaty so important to both countries and to the administration of justice.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at Nine o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
before Five oclock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 3rd August, 1876.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Parochial Records* [283].

Select Committee—Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment (Dublin)* [207], *nominated.*

Considered as amended—Elementary Education [277].

Third Reading—Tralee Savings Bank* [275].

Withdrawn—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2)* [194]; Union of Benefices* [248].

ARMY—COURT MARTIAL ON CAPTAIN ROBERTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. STACPOOLE asked the Judge Advocate General, Whether it is the fact that Captain Roberts, of the 94th Regiment, made formal application to the Horse Guards that the Court Martial directed to be held on his conduct, while stationed at Newry, should take place, not at Belfast, but in London, in order that he might have the benefit of the evidence of two Members of Parliament, Lord Francis Conyngham and the Right honourable Sir Colman O'Loghlen, who were unable to absent themselves from the House of Commons; whether such application was not refused, and Captain Roberts thereby deprived of his common law right to a change of venue, and of the material advantage to be derived from the aforesaid evidence; whether it is not the fact that the charges made against Captain Roberts were framed in direct violation of the instructions contained in the third paragraph of the Appendix (A) to the Queen's Regulations, which directs that "in framing charges care should be taken to render them specific in names, dates, and places," inasmuch as there was no mention made in the charges of the name of the gentleman to whom Captain Roberts is alleged to have written, or of the date of such communication; whether an Officer holding Her Majesty's Commission is thereby deprived of the legal right to address a communication to a private friend seeking counsel and advice; whether, after the close of the case for the prosecution, it was either legal or equitable to admit the evidence of Sergeant Burgess; whether the finding of the Court Martial was the unanimous opinion of the Officers constituting that tribunal; and, whether there will be any objection to lay upon the Table of the House, before the promulgation of Captain Roberts' sentence, Copies of the full record of the charges, evidence, statements of prosecutor and prisoner, and of the Deputy Judge Advocate, and the finding of the Court Martial?

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK, in reply, said, it was the fact that Captain Roberts made the application stated in the Question of the hon. Member; but the application was refused as being contrary to usage, and also on the sufficient ground that of about 60 witnesses examined 57 were in the Belfast district, while only three were in London, and of these three not one was summoned by the prisoner as necessary to his defence. He would remind the hon. Member that there was no such thing as a common law right to a change of venue; and having a regard to all the circumstances, the prisoner was clearly not deprived of any advantage by the course which was followed. The charges upon which Captain Roberts was arraigned, both legally and specifically alleged, the offences for which he was tried, and he was of opinion that those charges were framed, not in violation of, but in conformity with the paragraph of the Queen's Regulations to which the hon. Member referred. He was also of opinion that an officer holding Her Majesty's Commission was not thereby deprived of the legal right to address a communication to a private friend seeking counsel and advice. He was of opinion that the Court acted both legally and equitably in admitting the evidence of Sergeant Burgess at the time when he was examined as a witness. He had no information as to whether the finding of the court martial was or was not the unanimous opinion of the tribunal; and having regard to the oaths prescribed by the 152nd Article of War, he could not inform the hon. Member if the Court were unanimous. It was not in accordance with the usual practice to entertain any application for the production of proceedings until after the promulgation.

TREATIES RESPECTING NON-EUROPEAN COUNTRIES — HERTSLET'S "MAP OF EUROPE BY TREATY."

QUESTION.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government will hold out any inducement to Mr. Hertslet, Librarian of the Foreign Office, to publish a Collection of Treaties respecting non-European Countries on the same plan as his recent work entitled "The Map of Europe by Treaty?"

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, the Government highly appreciated the work alluded to, and he believed it would be a useful thing if a similar book respecting Treaties affecting non-European countries was published. No representation had, however, been made to the Treasury by the Foreign Office.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he would repeat the Question to-morrow to the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC HEALTH — THE SHEERNESS SEWERS.—QUESTION.

MR. PEMBERTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true that on the 21st ultimo a man employed by the authorities of the War Office at Sheerness lost his life in cleaning out a drain owing to the foul air and gas; and, whether such drain had been allowed to remain uncleansed for many months, although the attention of the officer who had charge of the drainage was repeatedly called to its condition by the Local Board of Health in the district?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: Yes, it is true. The drain in question was regularly emptied every 24 hours, and special means of flushing are provided; but these means had not been in use in consequence of the water in the moat from which it is flushed having been drawn off to allow the Local Board to obtain earth from the moat for formation of the sea embankment, which earth was given them by the War Office. The Local Board have on two occasions stated the outlet of this drain to be a nuisance, but the accident occurred over 400 yards from this outlet, at a man-hole which has never been complained of, and which has not been opened for 20 years. At the Coroner's inquest a verdict of "Accidental Death" was given after a thorough investigation. The drain has always been in good working order, and a letter received this morning from the Town Clerk of Rochester reports that the spot has been inspected by the principal water bailiff, and—

> "that there is no nuisance existing by reason of the discharge of the sewage, and that no nuisance is occasioned provided the sluice is opened at proper intervals (it is opened regularly every 24 hours), and that due provision appears to have been made in this respect up to this time."

ARMY (INDIA)—ARREARS OF PAY. QUESTION.

Colonel JERVIS asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any reply has yet been made to the letter of His Excellency the Commander in Chief in India, dated Head Quarters, Simla, 9th August, 1875, addressed to the Adjutant General to the Forces, Horse Guards, War Office, London, respecting arrears of pay due to certain officers of Her Majesty's British troops by the Government of India, and as such letter refers to previous communications and concerns a number of officers of high standing in the service, he can explain the cause of so unusual a delay; and, whether he is aware that His Excellency the Commander in Chief in India, by letter dated Simla, 1st April, 1875, Deputy Adjutant General's, Royal Artillery, directed the Commander in Chief of the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras not to forward any further applications, as a reply was shortly expected on the subject from the Horse Guards?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, that no reply had been made to the letter dated 9th August, 1875, as no decision had yet been received from the India Office to the references made to that Department on the subject of the claims put forward in that letter. Nothing was known in the War Office of the letter dated Simla, April 1, 1875.

ARMY—CAPTAIN ROBERTS—THE 94th REGIMENT.—QUESTION.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Secretary of State for War, If he has any objection to produce the Certificate regarding the soldierly and satisfactory condition of Captain Roberts's Company, 94th Regiment, which Captain Mackinlay, at the recent Court Martial in Belfast on Captain Roberts, admitted having written and signed when he took over that Company on the occasion of Captain Roberts being removed from the command by Colonel Lord John Taylour; and, whether it is not the fact that, at the same Court Martial, Captain Mackinlay deposed on oath that Captain Roberts's Company, at the time of his, Captain Mackinlay, being appointed to the command thereof, was in a most unsatisfactory and bad condition?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: The certificate regarding the company of the 94th Regiment referred to is connected purely with the interior economy of a regiment, and does not refer to the order of the company as regards drill and appearance or cleanliness of the men, but to the condition of the arms and accoutrements, accounts, &c. The document is as follows:—

> "I certify that I have received over the arms and accoutrements, great coats and necessaries, together with the accounts of Letter H Company, from Captain F. Roberts. I am perfectly satisfied with the same and become responsible for company from this date.
>
> "J. Mackinlay, Lieutenant
> 94th Regiment.
>
> "John W. Taylour."

Should it appear to His Royal Highness the Field-Marshal Commanding-in-Chief that there is any discrepancy between Captain Mackinlay's certificate and his evidence on oath, the matter will be dealt with by the military authorities as a question of discipline.

ARMY—THE MONCRIEFF GUN CARRIAGE.—QUESTION.

Mr. MAITLAND asked the Secretary of State for War, For what reasons the experiments on Major Moncrieff's hydro-pneumatic system of gun carriages have not been further proceeded with?

Lord EUSTACE CECIL, in reply, said, the experiments had not been proceeded with, because such gun-carriages were not required for heavy guns. The question as to whether such carriages should be used for siege purposes was now under consideration.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1872—MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH.—QUESTION.

Dr. CAMERON (for Dr. Lush) asked the President of the Local Government Board, If he will state to the House the reasons why he has recently refused to confirm the appointments of medical officers of health for a longer period than one year; and, on what grounds it is believed that such a limitation of tenure is likely to operate beneficially in securing activity and efficiency in the performance of the duties of sanitary officers?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, under the Act of 1872 it was provided that the first appointment of medical officers of health should be for a period of five years. An experimental period was adopted in order to see whether the arrangement was satisfactory, or whether any change would be desirable. He agreed that the efficiency of an officer was increased by the permanency of his appointment, and the practice was to sanction permanent appointments where the medical officer of health devoted his whole time to the performance of his duties. In cases where he did not devote his whole time he (Mr. Sclater-Booth) thought that the rule of five years would be convenient. The Report of an experienced Inspector reviewing the whole question would soon be submitted to him.

ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—THE BUCKS YEOMANRY.

QUESTION.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD (for Mr. E. Hubbard) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been drawn to a letter written by the Lieutenant Colonel of the Royal Bucks Yeomanry on January 1st, 1876, to the Inspector of Auxiliary Cavalry, acknowledging the letter of the War Office 0070 | 734, which not only ordered the guns attached to the Regiment to be returned to store, but disbanded the men and serjeants of the two troops of Artillery themselves; and, whether, in view of the testimony of the Commanding Officer to the efficiency of these two Troops as Yeomen, and to the great sacrifice of time and money made by both officers and men in learning the additional duties of artillerymen, he would think it right to accept the offer of their continued service in the Regiment as Light Cavalry, with some acknowledgment of the services they have already rendered?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, his attention was drawn to the letter in question, which was duly replied to. In communicating to the Officer Commanding the Bucks Yeomanry on the 15th December, 1875, that the two Artillery troops could no longer be permitted to form part of the establishment of the regiment, and that they must be disbanded; it was not the intention that these troops should be necessarily disbanded in the literal sense, but that they should be discontinued as Artillery and their guns withdrawn, the troops remaining in the regiment as Cavalry, and retaining with their officers their regimental positions. This was subsequently explained to the Officer Commanding by letter dated the 26th of January last. The services rendered by the Artillery troops and their efficiency were fully appreciated, and an expression of the appreciation of Her Majesty's Government of their efficiency was made to the Officer Commanding on the 15th December last.

THE ROYAL MINT—THE NEW SITE.

QUESTION.

Mr. HANKEY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether a map has been prepared and laid upon the Table of the House, showing that the site of the present Mint comprised in the gross 203,624 superficial feet, or a little more than four acres of ground, of which 13,775 superficial feet, are now let on an unexpired term of six and a quarter years, and that the ground required for the Mint which it was proposed in 1871 to build on the Thames Embankment was only 123,174 superficial feet, thus showing that a new Mint could be erected on the present site, and leave

6,675 superficial feet, or about one and -half acres to spare, and which could be sold in part payment of the cost of a new Mint on the present site?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that the figures which the hon. Member had given were accurately quoted from the map in the Library. The frontage of the Mint was very narrow, and a new Mint could not be erected on a part of the present site without pulling down the main building and incurring enormous expense. There was only one Mint in this country, and the coinage could not be carried on during the reconstruction of the building, nor could it be suspended. Owing to the shape of the existing site the back part of the premises could not be sold with advantage, as there would be great difficulty in obtaining access to it. It would be much cheaper, even if it were not absolutely necessary, to sell the present unwieldly site and place a new Mint, properly arranged and concentrated, on a new and more convenient one.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS—LIGHT DUES.—QUESTION.

Mr. NORWOOD asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether the increase of five per cent. recently made in Light Dues on Shipping was rendered necessary by a falling off of receipts below the amount required for the maintenance of the service; and, if that be not the case, to inquire the purpose to which this increased revenue will be applied?

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY: The recent increase of 5 per cent in the light dues has been rendered necessary by a falling off of receipts below the amount required for the maintenance of the service. The reserve fund, which in April, 1874, was £250,000, had in April, 1876, fallen to £60,000. There is also an increased expenditure going on in supplying fog signals at several light stations.

PUBLIC HEALTH—THE EAGLEY MILK EPIDEMIC.—QUESTION.

Mr. CHARLEY asked the President of the Local Government Board, When the Report of Mr. Power, the Commissioner appointed by the Board to inquire into the circumstances connected with the Eagley milk epedemic, will be presented?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, the Report on the subject had been communicated to the sanitary authorities interested.

ARMY—MILITARY PRISONERS—HANDCUFFS.—QUESTION.

Mr. HAYTER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been drawn to the injury done to a soldier travelling under arrest in the Bourton accident to the Great Western Express on the 27th ult.; whether he is aware that, in the West Drayton accident to the same express, another case of injury through a prisoner travelling in handcuffs occurred; and, whether he will either direct that prisoners under arrest be not conveyed by these fast express trains or will permit the removal of their handcuffs?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: It has been mentioned in the newspaper that a soldier was injured in the late railway accident, but no official report has been received at the War Office. I am not aware that a prisoner when travelling in handcuffs was injured in the West Drayton accident; no report was made of such an occurence. Soldiers do not, as a rule, travel by fast express trains; but it would be undesirable to prevent prisoners being taken by these trains when necessary. Handcuffs are necessary for the safe custody of prisoners.

COMMERCIAL FRAUDS.—QUESTION.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government has yet considered the question of amending the Law and procedure for dealing with Financial and Commercial Frauds in their modern developments; and, whether it is proposed to take any action on the subject?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, the question referred to by the hon. Member was, no doubt, one of considerable difficulty; but he was advised that a Bill had been brought in by the hon. Member for Macclesfield (Mr. Chadwick) which would, to a great extent, prevent the frauds which were referred to in the Question. The hon. Member for Macclesfield had been assured by the Government that they would be very glad to see that Bill become law, and if it did not become law during the present Session, he trusted that either under the auspices of the hon. Member or of the Government, some similar measure might be passed into law during next Session.

TURKEY—GUARANTEED LOAN 1855.

QUESTION.

Colonel MURE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the coupons and drawings of 1855 Turkish Guaranteed Loan, due on the 1st August, have been paid; if so, whether the funds out of which such payments have been made were deposited in the Bank of England or France on the Egyptain Tribute Account, under the Third Article of the Convention between England and the Sublime Porte, by which these payments form a special charge on the annual amount of the Tribute of Egypt "which remains over and above the part thereof appropriated to the 1854 Loan;" or, whether the money has been paid or supplemented by the Governments of England and France, or from any other source?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The best answer I can give to the Question of the hon. and gallant Member will be to mention the facts. On Saturday, the 29th of July, the Bank of England wrote to the Treasury that the necessary funds had not been provided to meet the charge of the Imperial Ottoman Guaranteed Loan of 1855, falling due on the 1st of August. On the 31st of July, the Treasury communicated this information to the Foreign Office, in order that a proper representation of the circumstances might be made to the Turkish Government. On the same day the Treasury informed the Bank that Her Majesty's Government were prepared to fulfil the guarantee which they had given jointly with the French Government and severally; but they (the Treasury) asked the Bank to advance the amount of the dividend in the first instance. This was an act of courtesy to the Turkish Government in order to afford them the opportunity of acting on the representation which had been made to them. On the 1st of August the Bank paid the dividend as requested by the Treasury. On the 2nd of August the Foreign Office forwarded to the Treasury a copy of a letter from the Turkish Ambassador, saying that he was in communication with his Government. Up to the present time no further information has been received. The facts have been made known to Lord Lyons for communication to the French Government.

UNITED STATES—EXTRADITION—RETURN OF CASES.—QUESTION.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When the Return respecting cases of Extradition between Great Britain and the United States, ordered several weeks ago, will be presented?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, the Government were anxious to make a Return as soon as possible, but the facts with regard to Canada had not yet arrived in this country. If the hon. and learned Gentleman would consult with him he would endeavour to meet his wishes on the subject.

CRIMINAL LAW (IRELAND)—THE CONVICT KIRWAN.—QUESTION.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is true that Kirwan, who was convicted of the murder of his wife, under circumstances of great atrocity, at Ireland's Eye, has been set at liberty; and, if so, on what and whose recommendation?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH presumed that the hon. Member referred to a convict whose name was not quite identical with that given in the Question, but who was convicted of this murder and sentenced to death, which sentence was commuted to penal servitude. He had not been set at liberty, and was still undergoing his sentence.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) BILL.

OBSERVATIONS.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: Sir, I have given Notice of my intention to move the adjournment of the Orders preceding that of the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill. But, Sir, as you have been good enough to inform me that I have not put down my Notice of Motion in a manner exactly in accordance with the Forms of the House,

hope hon. Members will allow me to
ake a short statement in moving the
djournment of the House. I have never
oved the Adjournment of the House
efore, and I hope never to move it
gain, in similar circumstances. I should
ave no other opportunity of explaining
hat has occurred; but I feel that I
ight to apologize to the House for
oing anything to prolong the most
eary, weary, dismal, doleful, and dis-
riting Session that I have ever known.
must also apologize to the noble Lord
e Leader of the Opposition for coming
his way, and I certainly should not
ave done it at any other time, or in any
her circumstances. If the Education
ill is so important, we surely should
member that the Bill of my hon. Friend
e Member for Londonderry (Mr. Smyth)
also an Education Bill; and being so,
think it ought to have the support of
e Representatives of the brewery trade
this House, from whom we have had
ree Motions in favour of religious edu-
tion. I wish seriously to say that I do
t think the Government have acted—
will use as mild a word as I can—quite
stifiably in regard to the Bill of my
n. Friend. I do not think they have
ted quite fairly to the House, to Ire-
nd, or to their own Party. Now, let
s look at the history of my hon. Friend's
ill. ["Oh, oh!"] It will not take
ng to tell. This Parliament is not a
ry old one, and I shall not go further
ack. The Resolution, founded on the
otion brought in in 1874, and in favour
which the Irish vote was 4 to 1, was
efeated by a course not creditable to
e opponents of the measure. I am not
laming the Government very strongly
r opposing the Resolution then, be-
ause they had just then come into office
n the appeal to the country; and the
structions the country gave them were
at they were to promote the sale of in-
xicating drinks in every possible way.
"Oh!"] If these were not the instruc-
ons why did they do it? We could not
xpect that in 1874 the Government
ould try to put a stop to the sale of
rink in Ireland when they were pro-
oting it in England. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the
on. Baronet that he is not at liberty,
nder cover of a Motion for the Adjourn-
ent of the House, to discuss the merits
f a Bill which is on the Orders of the
louse.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: May I ask whether I am empowered to allude to the conduct of the Government with respect to the Bill, keeping in my remarks clear of the merits of the measure?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Baronet would be quite in Order in asking the Government to give him a day for the discussion of the Bill which is in charge of the hon. Member for Londonderry; but to discuss the merits of the Bill upon the present occasion would be quite out of Order.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: In that case I will merely discuss the conduct of the Government in reference to the Bill. In 1875 a scene occurred when my hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry brought in a Bill which must be fresh in the recollection of hon. Members. There was a majority expected in favour of the Bill; but a short time before the hour for adjournment the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) rose, and amid loud cries of anguish from all sides of the House, said it was too late then to proceed further with a measure of such importance, and moved the Adjournment of the House. I say he did that with the connivance of Her Majesty's Government. I have heard it stated in the North, where the hon. and learned Member came from, that there was an intention to make him a Baronet by way of reward for his service. More than that, I have been told, under no seal of secrecy, that when the Prime Minister called together his Supporters shortly after to discuss the political situation of the day, he made the strongest appeal to them to assist him in getting rid of the Bill of the hon. Member for Londonderry. That appeal was successful. This year my hon. Friend obtained a majority of 57 in favour of his Resolution, comprising 5 to 1 of the Irish Members and 10 to 1 of the Scotch. Upwards of 40 Tory Members preferred their principles and the good of their country to Party ties, and I honour them for it. A remarkable event happened on that occasion. Three Gentlemen officially connected with the Government, and representing Irish constituencies, walked out of the House without voting—the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, who represents the county of Dublin (Colonel Taylor), the hon. and learned Solicitor General for

Ireland, who sits for Dublin University, and the noble Lord who represents Enniskillen (Viscount Crichton). We know what the noble Lord said when he went down to his constituents. He said that no personal considerations should be allowed to stand in the way of duty, and that his joining the Government might give him an opportunity of serving his countrymen. "For instance," he added, "there was the Sunday Closing Bill, and in regard to that subject he would be able to bring public opinion before the Government in an authoritative manner." That is what was said by one of the most respected officials of the Government. It has been said that in the last debate Cork was against the Bill; but there has been an election in Cork since that time, and the result has been the return of a Tory Member, whose first speech was in favour of the measure. If a Resolution on an English question was supported by 5 to 1 of the English Members, would a day, would an hour have been lost before the Government brought in a Bill to give effect to that Resolution? Especially if public opinion had been in favour of it, as you know it is in Ireland —["No!"]—where it is as near unanimity as anything can be in Ireland. What is the use of crying, "No," when the facts are before us? It is not only the magistrates and the clergy, but even the publicans are in favour of it, and this is a fact that should carry weight with hon. Gentleman opposite. Although there was such a great majority, however, the Government would give no facilities for getting on with the Bill. The Prime Minister gave the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) facilities for the discussion of his Land Bill, which was not supported by anything like the unanimity in favour of this Bill, and I cannot understand why the same facilities should not be given to this Bill. My hon. Friend, however, got a day in spite of them, and he got it on a day when there were three Motions before his. Those Motions were by a Home Ruler, an English Liberal, and a Scotch Tory, and they all made way for my hon. Friend. No one dared to divide against the Bill on the second reading, and the consequence of a speech then made by the Chief Secretary for Ireland was that the Government was complimented by a distinguished speaker on their entire good faith in removing this matter from the stage of Parliamentary discussion and putting an end to contention. In spite of all that complimenting, a fortnight elapsed before they could extract from the Chief Secretary the Amendments he was to propose in the Bill. It was like drawing teeth to get them out of him. I have the fear of you in my eye, Sir, and so will not discuss those Amendments; but, whether they are good or bad, the Government should have seen that an opportunity was given for discussing them. But after the Prime Minister gave the promoters of the Bill a Wednesday's sitting, the Chairman of Ways and Means brought on a discussion, which lasted an hour and a-half, on a Resolution which was subsequently withdrawn, and which prevented that full discussion of the Bill which was anticipated. The Mover said that it was not his purpose to prevent the discussion of the Bill, which was no doubt very true. I put it to the Government if it is really too late to save this Bill from the Massacre of the Innocents, and I am sure there is not a more innocent Bill in the whole lot. In any case, be it understood that it is not the machinations of the hon. Member for Dundalk (Mr. Callan), and his little band of heroes who count out and talk out on every possible occasion, but the action of the Government to which the defeat of the Bill is due. It has been argued that the Session is too far advanced to get the Bill through; but it should not be forgotten that last year at this very time they were engaged in discussing a very important Bill—the Merchant Shipping Bill. That Bill was read a second time on the 30th of July, and a third time on the 6th of August, and was subsequently passed by the House of Lords. The Prime Minister, it is true, attributed the passing of that Bill to a dramatic incident; but it was not so important as this Bill, because a distinguished Member of the Government —the Judge Advocate General—was down in the country lately, and spoke about it as rather a miserable affair which would only affect some 700,000 persons. There is plenty of time to pass the measure, to which the Government has given its assent on the principle through an Amendment that has been proposed. Let us proceed with the debate, and come to a decision on a question which has secured an amount f unusual unanimity in Ireland. We have been told that we can do nothing, as the Session is too far advanced. It is quite possible to get this Bill through yet if anybody is in earnest about it. In the case of the Merchant Shipping Bill, to which I have referred, I think it is a folly that the Government will not carry a Bill through this House unless some one stands on one leg and shakes his fist at the Prime Minister. There is time. Do not talk to me about the House of Lords not passing it. I know as much about the House of Lords as anybody else, and I do not think that any House of Lords could nail its colours to the mast and say that it is desirable to make Irishmen drunk on Sundays. I do ask the right hon. Gentleman to look into this matter, and give us some little assistance. It may be true, or it may be not, that the Government do not mean to offend English publicans. I have told you before that Irish publicans do not care much about it. I have heard from the right hon. Gentleman that he has not said a single word that could commit him to the publicans. He might throw them over to-morrow, and he would be quite consistent. I hope he will. With one word he could carry the Bill now. [“No, no!”] Yes, he has plenty of time to put it down and the same evening to get it through. But I say that if he refuses this almost unanimous, this earnest, this constitutional demand from the Irish people, he is the greatest upholder of Home Rule that is to be found, and he will perpetuate Irish dissatisfaction and discontent. I think the House is entitled to have more facilities given to it for carrying the Bill. If the Government persists in the dead weight of opposition, my hon. Friend has no chance; but I would appeal to the Government, even now at the eleventh hour, to give this House an opportunity of maintaining its own decisions, and, at the same time, do an act of justice which is demanded by the almost unanimous voice of the Irish people. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, “That this House do now adjourn.”—(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson.*)

Mr. DISRAELI: I cannot help feeling, Sir, that the exhaustion of the Session is to some degree evidenced by the remarks of the hon. Baronet, as they lacked that vivacity which has so often amused us; but what has struck me as remarkable in his speech is that I could not gather from it what his complaint really is. The hon. Baronet regrets that a Bill in which he is deeply interested has not passed, and that is a regret with regard to other measures that I can share with him. But that justifies the remarks the hon. Baronet has made. Now, without going into any long story as to the history of the Bill to which he refers, let us look at its course during the present Session. There was a division called for in a very full House upon a Resolution which was to be the foundation of the Bill. The Government opposed the Resolution, and were defeated by a considerable majority in a full House. Well, what was the course we took? I do not think 24 hours elapsed—certainly a very short time did—before we communicated with the promoters of the Bill, and stated that we should look upon that majority in favour of the Resolution as equivalent to a vote in favour of the second reading of the Bill. Is that conduct of which any one can complain, or make the foundation of a charge against the Government that they have been extending to this Bill an unfair opposition? Well, that being the case, the hon. Baronet proceeds with his complaint, and says that my right hon. Friend the Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant was a fortnight in preparing his Amendments. I am not aware that a fortnight is a long time to take in a work of the kind when you are attempting to reconcile the passing of a Bill, the principle of which you have opposed, with circumstances which you think may be attended with inconvenience and injury to the public. After the lapse of a fortnight, then, the Amendments were laid on the Table, and the time arrived at which the fate of the Bill might have been decided, and, had the Amendments been accepted, the stage of the Bill would have been passed. Who refused to accept the Amendments? Why, the promoters of the Bill. [“No!”] No, then I have been entirely misinformed as to what occurred yesterday. If the promoters of the Bill accepted the Amendments, I believe it was unknown to us. Then we hear it said this Bill is one that has been supported unanimously by the Irish Members. [An hon. MEMBER: Almost.] Almost! Almost is a very ambiguous word. I must look to facts in attempting to guide the House in the management of their Business. What are the facts of yesterday? There was a debate on this Bill. A great many Irish Members spoke. Ten Irish Members spoke, and they all spoke against the Bill. What evidence was that of almost unanimity on both sides? We can only draw from that circumstance that this Bill, which might have been passed if the Amendments of my right hon. Friend the Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant had been accepted, was, in fact, defeated by the continuous speaking of Irish Members on both sides of the House. It has been said that hon. Gentlemen who opposed the Bill spoke against time, and that may be true; but, if it is true, why did not hon. Members who desired that the Bill should pass denounce the practice, or answer the arguments adduced, instead of remaining perfectly silent during the whole debate. All we know is that the whole morning was taken up by Irish Members speaking, and speaking against the Bill. The hon. Baronet has complained that the Chairman of Ways and Means wasted a considerable portion of the Sitting before this Bill was reached by speaking on another question. With regard to that matter, I can only say that the hon. Gentleman, as an independent officer of the House over whom I have no control, spoke in the fulfilment of a most important duty. He rose to move Resolutions founded on the Report of what is rarely heard of, a united Committee of the two Houses of Parliament. That certainly was a duty which he was called upon to fulfil, but what did the Government do even under those circumstances? Why, my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary absolutely rose and prevented discussion. Instead of inviting discussion, instead of occupying the greater part of the morning, which he might have done, on a matter which all must acknowledge was of grave interest, my right hon. Friend absolutely suppressed discussion to give a fair opportunity to Irish Members to advance this measure in which they are so deeply interested, and of which all the English public know is that 10 Irish Members each, one after another, opposed it. However mortifying, therefore, the result of the discussion may have been to the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle, I think the House and the country will agree with me when I say that he has no shadow of a claim to object to the conduct of the Government on the occasion. It must be the memory of some previous mortification in connection with a congenial subject that has induced the hon. Baronet to charge upon an innocent Administration a desire to impede the progress of the Bill which had been introduced by the hon. Member for Londonderry. I trust, under these circumstances, that the House will not assent to the Motion, but will proceed with the Business on the Paper.

MR. R. SMYTH: I do not, Sir, rise under any feeling of mortification, such as has been curiously ascribed to my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfred Lawson), nor do I intend to utter any words of complaint. A complaining man is usually taken to be a beaten man, and I do not acknowledge myself to be in that condition at all, having in my mind the experiences of the present Session. There was at least one statement just made by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government which came upon me with considerable surprise, to the effect that, after the carrying of the Resolution on the 12th of May, the Government did not allow 24 hours to pass until the promoters were made acquainted with their intention to accept the decision of the House as equivalent to a vote on the second reading of the Bill. Now, all I can say is that no such communication ever reached me. On the evening before the second reading of the Bill there were vague rumours through the Lobby that the Government did not intend to oppose the second reading; but until the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland rose in his place to announce the intention of the Government, I had no idea whatever, founded on authentic information, what these intentions were. I think it extraordinary that a message should have been sent to those hon. Members whom the right hon. Gentleman has designated the promoters of the Bill, and that this message failed to reach me who had mainly the charge of the measure. If I may be allowed to allude to the events of yesterday, I shall do so in no spirit of bitterness, or of complaint at all. I beg to assure the House that when we pressed forward the consideration of the Bill, we had no other motive or expectation than the bringing about a moderately satisfactory settlement this year. The right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland and my hon. Friend the Member for Dublin (Mr. Maurice Brooks), who moved the Amendment, know, and they knew yesterday, that if we had got into Committee I was prepared to make a statement which might have facilitated the progress of the measure. So anxious were the friends of the Bill to get into Committee, that we agreed among ourselves to observe a strict silence, in order that there might be no excuse for wasting time in the discussion of a principle which had been so thoroughly considered in a previous debate; and so strictly was that covenant observed that out of the 61 Irish Members who voted or paired for the principle of the Bill not one man opened his lips yesterday. The whole of the speaking was confined to the 11, or a portion of the 11 Irish Members who voted against it, reinforced by some two or three neutrals, whose opinions appear to be as yet unformed and of a somewhat flabby character. I deny in the most emphatic manner that we had any purpose before our mind except a settlement of the question—and such a settlement as, preserving our own consistency and liberty of future action, would have taken into account any reasonable wishes of the Government. That was perfectly well known to the right hon. Baronet opposite; but I suppose it was not considered necessary to communicate it to the head of the Government. If I may express an opinion which I profoundly entertain, I will say that the waste of time which occurred at the commencement of the Sitting yesterday contributed largely to bring us into that condition of dead-lock in which we are now unhappily placed. I do not for one moment intend to convey to the House that the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means was in concert or had any understanding with the hon. Member for Dundalk, but the fact is, that to all appearance, the expenditure of time was deliberately wasteful, for the Chairman of Ways and Means said at the opening of his speech that the conversation upon his Resolutions was not likely to come to any definite issue. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. Gentleman could not refer to former debates.

MR. R. SMYTH: Well, then, that which occurred yesterday at the commencement of the Sitting, unwittingly on the part of the hon. Gentleman, afforded substantial aid and comfort to the hon. Member for Dundalk to fight this Bill, not by argument, but by the hands of the clock. And now what is to be done? If we made no declaration yesterday with reference to the Amendments of the Government, the reasons of that silence on our part are perfectly obvious. We had no certainty as to the issue of the measure this Session. It might not pass after all, and I may as well candidly say, that if the war is to be carried on in Ireland throughout the Recess, it will be a much simpler thing for the people of Ireland to continue it on the old lines, and not in any way embarrassed by premature compromises. But I think the time has come when the Ministry, as such, ought to take this subject earnestly in hand. I suppose I have done all that can reasonably be expected of a private Member. I am perfectly well aware, as every hon. Gentleman in this House is aware, that no Bill vigorously opposed can be carried by a private Member without the co-operation of the Government. But if it is still the opinion of the Government that this question, which has now become one of undoubted importance, should be left in private hands, all that remains for me is to move that the Order for going into Committee be discharged for the present, and to give Notice that at the earliest moment next Session I shall ask leave to introduce the Bill exactly as it stands, and I will make my appeal once more to the judgment of the House of Commons.

MR. RAIKES: The hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), by what was no doubt a slip of the tongue, has imputed to me purposes which it is not customary in Parliament for one Member to impute to other Members. I feel sure, from what I know of the hon. Baronet, that on reflection he will be the first to regret that he should have imputed to any Member purposes which he would have resented if they had been imputed to himself. I do not care to defend myself against any insinuations thrown out by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. R. Smyth). His natural feeling of disappointment at the loss of his Bill may be held an entire excuse for anything he may care to say about me; but I feel it only right to this House, of which I am an officer, and to the Government, of which I am not a Member, to say that the course I took yesterday—certainly a deliberate course on my part—was taken in concert with nobody, without any communication passing between me and the Government, or between me and the hon. Member who opposed the Bill. That course was taken by me simply because yesterday appeared to me to be the best occasion I could take during the few remaining days of the Session for the discussion of a matter which I regarded as one of great public importance. The hon. Members who have objected to the course I took know very well—or if they do not I hope there are few Members of the House who do not know—that I have carefully studied to avoid any imputation of being a partizan ever since I have had the honour of having a seat at this Table; and it has been simply as the mouthpiece, as the very humble mouthpiece, of a very important body—the joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament, dealing with a question of very great importance—that I ventured to trouble the House yesterday. I may have been right or I may have been wrong in thinking that the conduct of the Private Business of this House is of more importance than the Bill of the hon. Member for Londonderry. I tell him, however, plainly and frankly that I think it infinitely more important. The Private Business of this House is a matter that affects millions of property; it affects the interests of great municipalities and of large populations, and it is of the highest importance, in my opinion, that the business should be conducted in a proper and becoming manner; and I venture to think a question touching upon that was more important than the prospects of a moribund Bill at the end of a moribund Session. I freely excuse the observations made by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle. I have too high an admiration for his public character to think that he could have willingly intended to wound me or to impute to me anything unworthy; but in the course I have marked out for myself as an officer of this House, I am not going to be deterred by any criticism from any individual Member, or by any fear of displeasing any one, no matter on what side of the House he may sit, from performing the duty that I think devolves upon me.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT said, that he had been from the first a cordial supporter of the Bill for closing public-houses in Ireland on Sundays, as it appeared to represent the almost unanimous wishes and sentiments of the people of Ireland; but, at the same time, he could not help giving his equally cordial testimony, having sat through the whole of the debate on the Wednesday in question, from 12 o'clock till the Bill was talked out at a quarter to 6 P.M., to the straightforward, honourable and manly conduct of the Government in regard to the Bill. When the Government found the strong feeling in its favour which existed on both sides of the House, and had listened to the representations on its behalf from all parts of Ireland, they had abstained from all further opposition, though the Chief Secretary had on more than one occasion expressed his own sentiments objecting to it. The Bill had therefore passed its second reading without any division, and the Prime Minister had even gone so far as to fix a day for going into Committee upon it, which actually was the Wednesday in question: nay, more, the right hon. Gentleman when appealing to the House a few days previously to have the two remaining Wednesdays during the Session surrendered to the Government for Public Business, when he found that there was an earnest desire that the hon. Member for Londonderry's (Mr. R. Smyth's) Bill should go into Committee and undergo consideration, at the same time, as the new clauses proposed by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, he at once most courteously withdrew the request he had made. It was not fair, now, to taunt the Government with interposing any obstacle in the way of the further progress of the Bill, for they had really done all in their power to expedite its progress, and even during the protracted discussion on Wednesday the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland had earnestly appealed to the Irish Members to allow the Bill (it being then 3 o'clock in the afternoon) to go into Committee and allow the clauses to be considered. The fact was that the Government were not at all to blame, but it was the determined hostility of certain Irish Members which barred all attempts at progress. He had waited himself for an opportunity to say a few words in favour of the Bill, and to deprecate further delay; but the hon. Member for Dundalk (Mr. Callan) had got possession of the House at half-past 4 P.M., and what did he do? He did not make a speech, but he actually continued reading extracts from Irish newspapers till the clock pointed to a quarter to 6, and the Bill was thus talked out after a tedious and protracted discussion of several hours, during which they had not advanced a single inch. He (Sir Eardley Wilmot) could not help saying that after the large majority by which the Motion of the hon. Member for the County of Derry had been originally carried early in the Session, and after the second reading of the Bill, afterwards introduced, without a division being challenged by those hon. Members for Ireland who opposed it, the conduct of the hon. Member for Dundalk was most unwarrantable. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER said, that on reflection the hon. and learned Baronet would see that he was applying motives to the conduct of an hon. Member of that House which were not admissible.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: I am sorry for having made an imputation on the hon. Member for Chester (Mr. Raikes) which was not well founded. I thought he was acting in concert with the Government; but I was wrong in making that statement, and I withdraw it and apologize for having made it. The hon. Member for Chester acted on his own responsibility, and said he did not make his Motion with any intention of delaying the Bill. My own impression is that it did delay the Bill. With the permission of the House I beg to withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

(*Viscount Sandon, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

[BILL 277.] CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."—(*Viscount Sandon.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in rising to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, principles have been introduced into this Bill since its Second Reading which were not then either mentioned to or contemplated by the House, which tend to disturb the basis on which Elementary Education now rests, to impede the formation of new schools, to introduce discord and confusion into the election of School Boards, and to place the management of schools in the hands of persons who neither contribute to their support nor are elected by the ratepayers,"

said: I hope the House will, in the first place, allow me to make a few words of explanation as to the exact form in which the Motion I am about to submit to it stands upon the Paper. My wish, of course, was, if the Forms of the House would permit, to place on the Paper a Resolution which would not in appearance have been so hostile to the whole progress of the Bill as that which now stands in my name. What I desired to do was to move the re-committal of the Bill, in order that certain clauses and provisions which were not in the Bill at the second reading might be considered and omitted, and I wished to place before the House the reasons why I desired to make that Motion. But on consultation with the authorities of the House I found that though it would be in my power to move the re-committal of the Bill, it would not be in my power to do so accompanied by a statement of the reasons which induced me to take that course, and I therefore was constrained to place on the Paper the Resolution which stands in my name. The Resolution which I have placed on the Paper, though undoubtedly hostile to the Bill, is, at the same time, not necessarily fatal to the progress of the Bill. If the Resolution were agreed to, the consideration of the Report would only be delayed, and it would be possible to move again that the Bill be re-considered. I admit in form it appears hostile to the Bill, and I have ventured, therefore, to offer to the House an explanation of the exact form in which it now stands. I need hardly tell the House I take that course with no intention of delaying the progress of the Bill. I do not think it necessary, and it is not my desire, that this Motion should lead to protracted debate. It would have been better if the principle of the Bill had been more fully and clearly debated, and if that course had been taken, I think the time of the House would have been saved. I know it is the opinion of hon. Members opposite that a great deal of time has been wasted in the discussion of the clause of the hon. Member for Leicestershire (Mr. Pell). I cannot agree in that opinion, because, though I think the clause to be most objectionable, I also think that the protracted discussion to which it was subjected, if it has not modified the spirit of the proposal, has to a great extent taken away its power of mischief—and I feel that time will not be wasted if I now ask the House at this stage of the progress of the measure to consider the changes which have been introduced since the Bill received the assent of the House on the second reading. This Bill was introduced, not as a change in the policy of the Education Act of 1870, but as an extension of the principles of that Act. The noble Lord, in the very moderate and judicious speech in which he introduced the Bill, dwelt chiefly upon the fact that under the Act of 1870 efficient schools had been provided almost over the whole country, that the advance in public opinion which had been made since 1870 had now rendered the country ripe for some further measures to enforce upon parents the undoubted duty of taking care that their children were educated, and that all that remained to be done was to proceed as we had begun. The country was now ripe for a system of universal compulsion of some kind or another. It is true they differed as to the direction in which that system of universal compulsion was to proceed. Many of us on this side of the House thought it would be a simpler and more efficient mode of proceeding if we advocated a system of direct compulsion, by making it the duty of every parent to educate his child, inflicting a moderate penalty to enforce this duty. That points of difference existed among us there can be no doubt; but at the time of the second reading we were almost unanimous in accepting the principle of the Bill, believing that principle to be the adoption of some system of universal compulsion in education. We were aware at the time that the Bill was to be for denominational schools, but we did not complain of this. I do not think it would be reasonable of us to expect the Government to throw away the great advantages which denominational schools had acquired by the legislation of 1870. I do not think it would have been reasonable to expect that they should not have taken care that the denominational schools, for which it is well known they entertain a decided preference, should receive their full share, and perhaps something more than their full share, of the advantages which would be gained by all schools. But I ask the House to consider the effect of the changes subsequently introduced in the Bill on the position of denominational schools and of Nonconformists who were in favour rather of unsectarian than the denominational system of education. Under the Act of 1870 denominational schools have been to a very great extent established all over the country, especially in the rural districts. These denominational schools were in many instances a heavy burden on their managers, because they had not the means of obtaining the payment of fees, or of enforcing the payment of fees. By this Bill the managers will be relieved of a great portion of the burden hitherto cast upon them, because they will be in a position to exact payment of such fees as it may be in the power of parents to pay, and also because of the number of children who will be compelled to attend school. What is the position of Nonconformists under the Bill as introduced? They were forced for the first time to send their children to schools of the character of which they did not altogether approve; they were forced by the provisions of this Bill to contribute to the prosperity and success of schools of a character they considered objectionable, but which they hoped might in the course of time disappear, not by the action of any violent change, but by the gradual change in the public opinion of the country, and give place to a system which in their opinion was vastly superior. This is the position of Nonconformists under this Bill. They were called upon to submit to these disadvantages in the name of educational progress, and, as the logical consequence of the legislation of 1870, passed by their own friends, and I think the House will admit that these circumstances do not make the grievance any less than it was before. Who are the persons to whom I have been referring? Are they persons of whose feelings, sympathies, and prejudices, the House ought to be negligent? Are they persons as to whose interests no respect ought to be entertained in this House? I will not go into religious topics. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, I know, have a monopoly of regard for religious education. But I would repeat what my hon. Friend the Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard) said on this subject. The Nonconformists are the descendants of those men who formed their congregations, not out of the ranks of the Established Church, but by going into the haunts of ignorance, poverty, and crime in times when the Church Establishment was less careful of religious instruction and education than it is now. But if I may not speak of religion, I may speak of liberty. I say these Nonconformists are men to whom, in this country, we owe a great deal politically. Almost every advance in liberty, from the time of the Stuarts to the time of the Reform Act of 1832, has been in a great degree promoted and assisted by the exertions of the Nonconformists. It is to them, as much, if not more, than to any other body in the country, that we owe the blessings of that free Constitution which, on both sides of the House, we prize so highly. These are men whose feelings and prejudices cannot be safely neglected by either side of the House. I should have thought, if not justice, at all events generosity would have led those having at their command a powerful majority in both Houses of Parliament to consider carefully the feelings, and even the prejudices, of these men, and when they knew that a measure would be distasteful to them they would have imposed it with the greatest consideration and forbearance. The Act of 1870 was in the nature of a compromise between the advocates of denominational and national education. That Act contained much that Nonconformists disliked exceedingly, but it contained two provisions or principles, one of which was a palliative of the essential and inherent vice of the measure, and the other was undoubtedly a redeeming element. The two principles are these: The Act of 1870 proceeded on the principle that denominational education should only be established in those districts where the existence of a certain amount of voluntary effort in support of schools showed that the feeling of the locality was in favour of the system. That was not by any means an exhaustive, it certainly was not an adequate test; but to a certain extent the existence of voluntary effort in support of denominational schools was a test of the character of the school, and that it was not in that district opposed to the feelings of the community. The second principle was the establishment of school boards. It was declared by Parliament that in districts where the community was not willing to come forward and make voluntary contributions in favour of denominational schools the management of the school should be not in the hands of magistrates or ministers of any denomination, but in the hands of representatives directly elected by the people. The principle, I say, was one which was, in the eyes of many, a redeeming feature of the Act of 1870. There are many of us — and I do not scruple to say I was one of them —who believe that the principle of school boards is the right and true principle in this matter. We believe that being the right and true principle, it will in the end prevail. We believe that when once the time has arrived that Parliament has declared the education of the country is the business, not, as formerly, of individuals, but is the business of the State itself, it becomes inevitable that, sooner or later, State education must be in the hands, not of individuals, but of representatives of the people. I think we have been in the habit of looking a little too much at the circumstances of the pecuniary support of schools as being the only element in the matter. No doubt schools cannot be supported without pecuniary contributions, and no doubt the making of those contributions gives to the contributors some right to interfere in the management of the schools. But pecuniary support is not the only element of the schools. The parents and the children are also important elements for consideration in the schools; and I do not know that we are to assume it as a settled principle that the pecuniary supporters of the schools alone are to be consulted about the management, and that the parents and the children are not to be allowed, unless under certain circumstances, to have any share in the management of the schools. Both the principle of voluntary denominational education and the principle of school boards have been attacked—not by the Bill introduced by the Government, but by measures which have since been introduced. It is quite true that the noble Lord, when he introduced the Bill, explained that there would be a provision in it which would relax in certain cases the existing rules as to the term of existence of schools in rural districts; but the provision was not a very clear one, and the House had no conception how it would work or the extent of its operation. Since the second reading that clause has been withdrawn, and it has been replaced by a clause which altogether abandons the principle hitherto adopted by Parliament—that assistance should be given to denominational schools only in proportion to the voluntary contributions. Is it now no longer a necessary condition that that voluntary support should be given. In fact, the word voluntary ought in this matter now to disappear altogether. These schools may be maintained entirely through the fees paid by parents, or by Parliamentary grants. They are denominational schools, but they are not voluntary schools with the provision which has hitherto existed. I need hardly say, after the lengthy debate on the clause of the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), that the school boards are attacked by the Bill. It is all very well to say that it is unnecessary school boards that have been attacked; but that adjective will not be any great comfort to those school boards that are in danger. What is the moment chosen by the Government and the Party opposite to attack the school boards? They have selected a most injudicious moment. At the very moment that the necessary work of the school boards has been, to a great extent, completed, and at a moment when, under the circumstances of the case, the school boards are most unpopular, that very moment is selected by the Party opposite to make this attack on the school boards. We know there is nothing in this country more unpopular than increasing the rates. We know that in many districts of this country the school boards must have caused a considerable increase of the rates. Compulsion, direct compulsion, too, may not in all cases be very popular—at all events, until its beneficial operations are made apparent. Whatever unpopularity may spring from these causes has full effect now, and this is the time selected by the Party opposite in making their attack on the system. Neither can we pass by the language used by the Government in speaking of school boards. I admit that in his opening statement the noble Lord spoke without disparagement of school boards; but in the course of the discussion in the Committee we have heard the noble Lord utter threats and hints—and they were terrible hints—respecting the unpopularity of school boards; and the language of some of the supporters of the Government, as we all know, has been more open and more decided. They have not taken the trouble to veil under any hints whatever their uncompromising hostility to school boards, whether in the case of necessary or unnecessary school boards. Now, I believe the Resolution which I have placed on the Paper makes certain assertions, and I venture to say none of them are capable of contradiction. I wish to go over those assertions one by one; I say that "principles have been introduced into this Bill since its second reading which were not then either mentioned to or contemplated by the House." The principle to which I refer is doing away with the condition of voluntary support to denominational schools. There was nothing said by the Government to induce any one to believe that the attack on the school boards would have received their support. I say further that this principle "tends to disturb the basis on which elementary education now rests," and I have endeavoured to explain to the House what, in my opinion, is the basis on which education now rests. The basis of the school-board system has undoubtedly been disturbed. I go on to say that this measure will "impede the formation of new schools." That statement cannot be contradicted. I say that "discord and confusion have been introduced into the election of school boards," because where before the question before the electors would be mainly educational, now you introduce a new element—whether the school board is to be allowed to exist any longer or not. Although the Amendment refers only to school boards which have no schools, all that a school board will have to do in certain cases will be to transfer its schools to denominational managers, and then they can get rid of the school board altogether. The concluding clause of my Resolution — namely, "that the Bill will place the management of schools in the hands of persons who neither contribute to their support nor are elected by the ratepayers," is a proposition which is self-evident, and upon which I need not dwell any further. Nothing is more frequently said than that education ought not to be made the subject of political debate. Nothing is more assented to, but nothing I think is more generally disregarded. My opinion is that that is inevitably so. I, for one, am unable to see how questions which affect the mind and conscience of men can be removed altogether from the arena of politics, and however much we may wish it, I do not think it is in our power to remove them from the political arena. I am of opinion that it would be well in the interest of education that a truce, and as long a truce as possible, should be secured between the contending Parties in educational politics. I believe that previously to the clause of the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) being introduced in Committee, it was possible that such a truce had commenced, and might have been extended to an indefinite period. I know very well that in many towns there are persons who are extremely anxious to re-open the war on all controverted questions. But I do not believe that the public opinion of the country was with them, and I think they felt themselves that the time had not arrived when the agitation upon the education question could be re-opened. But I must say that the action of the Government has gone very far towards re-opening the whole question. I cannot see on what ground of political justice it can be contended that if the Party in power has the right, and exercises the right, of altering the settlement made in 1870, the other Party will not be justified when they have the opportunity, in re-opening the question. Therefore, I think it is right that we should take this opportunity of placing upon record our opinion, and I for one, most distinctly and decidedly hold that if these educational controversies are to be re-opened, it is due not to the Party on this side of the House, but to the action of the Party that sits on the other side. It is for these reasons—because I think the changes introduced are educationally inexpedient, and some of them politically unjust, and because they tend to re-open questions and divisions amongst us, which might otherwise have been settled or remained quiet—that I have ventured to place this Amendment upon the Paper, and I ask the House, at all events, in dealing with this Resolution, to allow me, and those who agree with me, to thus place upon record the objections we entertain to this Bill.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, principles have been introduced into this Bill since its Second Reading which were not then either mentioned to or contemplated by the House, which tend to disturb the basis on which Elementary Education now rests, to impede the formation of new schools, to introduce discord and confusion into the Election of School Boards, and to place the management of schools in the hands of persons who neither contribute to their support nor are elected by the ratepayers,"—(*The Marquess of Hartington,*)

—instead thereof.

VISCOUNT SANDON: The noble Lord has told the House that he would be glad to establish a truce on educational subjects, and, at the same time, has not hesitated to inform the House very plainly that, in his opinion, educational matters can hardly help being treated politically. Now, I confess that this remark is calculated to increase the satisfaction with which I listened to the noble Lord's opening words, when he said that, looking at the Government Bill, and, putting aside two or three clauses, he could not avoid paying a tribute to the measure as a whole; for it is, indeed, considerable praise to the Government Bill that it should obtain so high a meed of approval from the Leader of the Opposition at the very moment when he states that education can hardly help being treated as a Party subject. Gratified though I am at the noble Lord's approbation of the Bill as a whole, which makes me feel that when he has more fully considered the Amendments to which he now objects he will not find them of the serious nature he apprehends, I was rather astonished, I must acknowledge, at some of his criticisms upon the conduct of the Government respecting the Amendment moved by my hon. Friend the Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), because I cannot but remember that the Committee has not, during the prolonged discussions on the Bill, received that active assistance from the noble Lord which, if he felt so keenly on the subject, they had a right to expect; and I, for one, must honestly say that when the noble Lord is not here it is always a great loss to the sense and wisdom of the House. I will not follow the noble Lord into a discussion of the old issue between direct and indirect compulsion, as, surely, we have amply discussed this question, and the opinion of the House, at least, may now be considered on that point to be virtually settled. When, however, the noble Lord speaks of the general assent which has been given to the principle of the Government Bill and pointedly charges this side of the House with the responsibility of any interruption of that harmony, I must remind the noble Lord that the Government has had to run the gauntlet of two set debates, and of three formal Divisions, any one of which, if successful against the Government, would have been, of course, fatal to the Bill. There has not, therefore, been that lying down of the lamb with the lion which might be supposed from the noble Lord's speech. First, the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) moved a Resolution in favour of direct compulsion, which was rejected by a considerable majority. Had this been successful, of course the Bill would have been lost, as the Government measure was framed on quite a different principle. The second reading was also divided against, though it was carried by a great majority. Further, the Bill had again to fight its way against another great obstacle. There was the important proposal moved by the hon. Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard), on going into Committee, that all schools should be put under public management. The noble Lord, with great consistency and courage, had opposed that Motion; but I think I have showed that, independently of various attacks in Committee on vital points, the earlier progress of the Bill has not been conducted through that calm and sunshine to which the noble Lord has referred. The noble Lord's remarks simply come to this, that formal attacks from his side of the House are not to be considered as interruptions of harmony, that the Government is to be applauded, as we have been, for assenting to many Amendments coming from his side—and almost all, and very important ones too, we have accepted from hon. Members on the Opposition Benches—but that if hon. Members make Amendments on this side, and the Government, having refused the greater number of them, accept at last some few which they consider improvements, and which do not affect the principles on which they announced their measure to be based, then we are all to be taunted with destroying the harmony of our proceedings and being the causes of the violent, unusual, and prolonged opposition which the noble Lord's Friends have lately displayed.

I must be allowed once more to remind the noble Lord that, in my opening speech, I invited Amendments, provided they were within the principles of the Bill, feeling anxious, on a subject of such importance and complexity, to get the advantage to the country of all the experience of the House; and also, that when on going into Committee I announced certain changes which, after the second reading debates, Government proposed to make in the earlier parts of the Bill, I expressly reserved to myself the right to propose or accept other Amendments—and this announcement of my reserve was warmly cheered by the noble Lord's Friends. But I pass on to further points in the noble Lord's speech. He was certainly quite right in saying that Members on the Ministerial side could not be expected to interfere with voluntary schools, as certainly he might have said the same of the Government. But more, I had assuredly hoped that he would also have said it of himself and of those with whom he now acts. For surely, neither he nor the Committee have forgotten that in 1870 the Leaders of the Party opposite declared that this Bill was not intended to interfere with voluntary schools at all; but now the noble Lord appears to be in favour of a universal school board system, the adoption of which would give the death-blow to voluntary schools. Unless the noble Lord and the Party opposite have changed their platform, he ought to have said boldly—"We do not wish or intend now, any more than when we assured the country of this in 1870, to attack or destroy voluntary schools." But the case seems now to be different. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) then said that his object was only "to fill up the gaps," and "not to supplant," but to complete the voluntary system. Now the noble Lord has raised a suspicion that if he could he would attack voluntary schools, though, I must say, I shall no longer be able to compliment the noble Lord on his wisdom, to say the very least of the proposal, if he intends, as his speech to-day would lead us to suppose, using a common phrase, to "run a rig" against the 12,000 voluntary schools all over the country. The noble Lord's speech has placed this matter in so serious a light, that I must beg the House to listen to the assurances of the then Prime Minister, on the faith of which the country accepted the Education Bill of 1870. After the right hon. Member for Bradford had assured the House—"Our object is to complete the present voluntary system and to fill up gaps," the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) said, on the third reading of the Bill of 1870—

> "It was impossible for us to join in the language or to adopt the tone which was conscientiously and consistently taken by some Members of the House who look upon these voluntary schools, having generally a denominational character, as admirable passing expedients, fit indeed to be tolerated for a time, deserving all credit on account of the motives which led to their foundation, but wholly unsatisfactory as to their main purpose, and, therefore, to be supplanted by something they think better. . . . . I am quite sure it will be felt that it has never been the theory of the Government."—[3 *Hansard*, cciii. 746.]

I cannot, however, bring myself to think that there is real cause for alarm, for the voluntary system has been built up gradually by our people themselves, and is in harmony with our habits and institutions, and I have a conviction that, as a matter of fact, the voluntary system is so deeply seated in the hearts of the people of England that even if it encounters the opposition of the noble Lord I believe it will survive his hostility. But I must now allude to an extraordinary assertion of the noble Lord's. He says that this Bill will for the first time force Nonconformists to send their children to denominational schools, of which they disapprove; but at this moment, wherever you have bye-laws for compulsion this may easily happen under the Act of 1870, for that Act does not allow the fact of there being only denominational schools available for a child to be a reasonable excuse, but only when they have no conscience clause would such a plea hold good. Further, however, the noble Lord must have forgotten or overlooked the fact that Mr. Dixon's Bill for universal compulsion and universal school boards in every town and village of the land, for which the right hon. Member for Bradford, I believe the noble Lord himself, and many of his friends, on various pleas, in concert with the hon. Members for Merthyr, Nottingham, Leicester, and other leading opponents of this Bill, voted earlier in this very Session, would have swept the Nonconformist children into denominational schools, for Mr. Dixon repeatedly said that under his Bill the school boards would have no power to interfere with voluntary schools or to build any where they were not wanted, any more than under the Act of 1870. Yet that Bill established compulsory school attendance everywhere. [Mr. W. E. Forster: By school boards.] Yes, but that did not alter the thing in the least, for no option was given to these universal school boards under Mr. Dixon's Bill, and whether there was only one school or many, they were to be bound to pass bye-laws to compel the attendance of children at school if they were not otherwise instructed, provided there was a Conscience Clause. Thus it was indisputable that Nonconformists' children would be just as much swept into denominational schools under the Bill brought forward by Mr. Dixon in three successive Sessions, and receiving the whole Nonconformist support on the side opposite, as under this Bill of the Government. If the noble Lord would examine the speeches made by Mr. Dixon and the right hon. Member for Bradford, they would put the matter beyond all shadow of doubt. The noble Lord said the Nonconformists had hoped that the voluntary schools would disappear. I did not think it possible that any legislator could take his stand in an argument merely upon the unsupported hopes of any Party. I want to know what reason had the Nonconformists for entertaining more than a a vague hope that the voluntary schools would disappear? During the discussions on the Act of 1870 the Nonconformists were told repeatedly by the Leaders of the Liberal Party in Parliament, the authors of the measure, that these schools were not intended to disappear. It seems then that they had no solid ground for considering the overthrow of the great voluntary school system of England as a part of the scheme of the Act of 1870; they had perhaps general, and perhaps not unnatural, aspirations that these schools to which they were opposed might perish under the new Act; but surely the noble Lord cannot seriously take up these vague hopes, which his own Government said at the time were not justified by their measure, as an element which ought to be taken into consideration by the House on the present occasion. The noble Lord has made so much of his attack depend upon the supposed fact that Nonconformists will be grievously wronged by the Bill owing to its driving Nonconformist children into denominational schools, that I must endeavour to show him that he is really mistaken as to its operation. I must therefore again quote the printed Circular issued from Birmingham after I introduced the Bill, by the Central Nonconformist Committee, which represents, I believe, the whole Liberal Party in the Nonconformist Bodies. I will ask leave to read the principal passage—

> "The effect of these proposals will be to introduce both direct and indirect compulsion into many parts of the country where Nonconformists are numerous, but where the only schools in existence are schools connected with the Established Church. The Committee feel strongly the injustice which is involved in compelling the children of Nonconformists to attend schools which are established with the avowed intention of educating children in the principles of the Church of England, and which are under the almost irresponsible control of the clergy. But practically the injustice already exists. It is one of the inevitable evils resulting from the denominational system. Nonconformists of every description are anxious to give their children as good an education as possible; but in many parts of England they have no choice of schools. They are obliged to send their children to the schools of the clergy or to leave them uneducated. We believe, therefore, that the number of Nonconformist children who are not actually at school, and who would be driven into Church schools by Lord Sandon's Bill is extremely few. The children whom the Bill would reach are for the most part the children of ignorant or careless parents, and it is better that they should be driven into the schools of the Church than that they should receive no education at all. While, therefore, we recognize the strength of the abstract objection to the compulsory proposal of the measure, we cannot recommend that these proposals should be resisted. In the interest of the neglected children and of the country at large, we think that they should be accepted.—Signed by W. Middlemore, J.P., chairman; R. W. Dale, H. W. Crosskey, J. Jenkyn Brown, hon. secs.; F. Schnadhorst, secretary.

It is signed, as the House has heard, by the well-known leaders of this party, and surely the House could not have better or less prejudiced evidence on this point than this testimony of the members of the Birmingham League. Some hon. Members had ventured to say that the Government had no care for the Nonconformists of this country. This was a very serious accusation to make, and should not be rashly made. I deny it entirely, and it is certainly a strange and unfortunate time to make such an assertion, seeing that the Government has within the last day or two willingly accepted a clause of no slight importance, which makes it the duty of the local school attendance authority in every town and village to report to the Education Department any infraction of the Conscience Clause. The noble Lord, according to the statements made by the public Press, mentioned this yesterday as an important clause, and I was publicly thanked in this House by the hon. Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard) for the cordiality with which the Government had accepted it. This one fact is worth many pounds of sentiment, and it shows the anxiety of the Government that no real grievance should be imposed under this Bill upon the Nonconformists. The noble Lord has gone over the different points in his somewhat remarkable Resolution. The first point was that the Government had introduced into the Bill since its second reading "principles which were not then either mentioned to, or contemplated by, the House." Does the noble Lord remember what passed with regard to the Act of 1870? I have never heard that it is wrong to introduce after the second reading very considerable Amendments into a Bill, and I imagine that older Members of the House would say that frequently large Amendments have been accepted by the Government after second reading, when a Government has had the advantage of hearing the criticism of Parliament and the country during the usual debates on introduction and second reading. I find, with reference to the Act of 1870, that many great alterations were accepted by the overnment of that day, of which the oble Lord was a distinguished Member, at a very late stage. For example, he school boards were, in the Bill as ead a second time, to have power to lot rates to voluntary schools. That as a most important feature of the measure, yet it was swept away after he second reading, and thus the whole haracter of the Bill was altered by the ction of the Government which introuced it. There was then a Conscience lause, but not a Time-table Conscience lause; and the whole character of that Conscience Clause was changed by making it necessary that the religious teaching, &c., should only be at the beinning and end of the teaching. That change again was made after the second eading. Then they all remembered he famous "Cowper-Temple Clause," which was not even foreshadowed in the early part of the debates on the Education Bill of 1870. That clause, as its title indicated—the "Cowper-Temple Clause"—came from an indeendent Member, and altered very materially the whole colour of the Bill. When the Bill was introduced we heard that there was to be perfect freedom of religious teaching; but by the adoption of that clause, religious teaching was shackled, and formularies distinctive of a particular denomination were forbidden in board schools. Again, the cumulative vote was accepted at the hands of a private Member after the second reading — a very considerable change both in principle and practice, and acknowledged to be a most important experiment in election arrangements by leading politicians all over the world. Again, have hon. Gentlemen opposite forgotten that vote by ballot was dragged in after the second reading of the Bill? The ballot was then one of the most hotly-disputed matters in politics; but it was foisted in, in obedience to the proposal of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles Dilke), at the end of the debates on the Bill. The country, I think, will surely feel that, in view of those great changes, the mouths of hon. Members opposite ought to be closed in respect of the two or three small changes which had been made in the present Bill, which did not exactly coincide with their views, but which were not for a moment to be compared in magnitude or wide-extended effect with those which the late Government introduced into their Education Bill of 1870—changes which were mostly exceedingly distasteful to hon. Members on the Conservative side, and of which no hint was given when they were invited, with success, to support that Bill in its earlier stages. But, next, in this famous Resolution it is said that these changes in our measure disturbed the basis on which elementary education in this country now rests. This is a very grave and a high-sounding sentence. I quite acknowledge, as the noble Lord has said, that the Government announced they were against any great reversals of policy, unless the country generally, and beyond a doubt, declared such reversals necessary, and I gladly again repeat what I said on this subject on behalf of Her Majesty's Government. But I must frankly say that beyond this general principle which affects all past legislation, I am not aware of any great compact such as the noble Lord alludes to, having been made by the Act of 1870. Hon. Members on the Conservative side gave, I must say, a very generous support to that measure, without which I do not believe it could have been carried, and being anxious primarily to secure the education of the whole people they made many sacrifices of matters connected with schools which were very distasteful to them, and I am sure they received very slight concessions to their views in return; but, to grant for one moment, only for the sake of argument, that some compact was made—which, however, I do not assent to—how have hon. Gentlemen on the front Opposition Bench, how has the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, how have hon. Members below the Gangway, kept that supposed compact? Has the compact remained up to this time unbroken? If the Government were to be told that they were culpable for having departed from that compact, why did hon. Members opposite vote for Mr. Dixon's Bill for the establishment of universal school boards, and for universal direct compulsion, involving a change of the general basis on which education rested? And why but a year or two ago did hon. Gentlemen opposite vote for abolishing the 25th clause, which was one of the essential arrangements of the famous Bill of 1870? I cannot, then, understand how hon. Gentlemen opposite can, with any feeling of propriety, throw into the teeth of the Government the charge that they were disturbing the basis on which the system of elementary education rests, when early this very Session, as before, they themselves had tried to disturb it still more. Further, how does the change as to the 17*s.* 6*d.* disturb this basis? Of course, as the House is well aware all State aid to schools is now made by Government upon the principle of payment by results. But Her Majesty's Government felt that this principle was not fully and fairly carried out, as deductions were now made from such earnings, unless half the expenses were met locally by fees or subscriptions. The change, therefore, which the Government had lately proposed was, that the State should hereafter ask no questions as to whence a school was supported, but should contribute up to 17*s.* 6*d.* per head, if the children earned it by their intellectual acquirements, a payment which would represent a simple solid education, but no nore. This change, I must remind the House, had been urged upon the Government by such a concurrence of good educational opinion of various sorts that they felt convinced that it was the best course to pursue in the interests of the country. I trust the House has not forgotten the very earnest appeal which was made on this subject to the Government by the London School Board, one of the best education authorities in the land, who represented that the promise made in 1870 had been really broken, because the average increase in the Government grant had not risen to more than 25 per cent, whereas expectations were held out in Parliament when Mr. Gladstone's Government decided that the provision should be taken out of the Bill by which school boards might aid voluntary schools out of the rates, that an increase of something like 50 per cent would be made in the State grant to all schools. Now, the figures quoted by the London School Board and elsewhere showed an enormous increase in the cost per child. Appeals from various quarters showed that owing to the conditions imposed by the Government the burdens were becoming almost intolerable to the schools both board and voluntary. The London School Board entreated the Government to interfere, on the ground that public injury of a very serious character would accrue to education if any large proportion of good elementary schools now under Government inspection were closed, or were transferred to the board, and that the destruction of these schools, independently of the educational loss, would entail such an enormous increased charge on the rates as could not be contemplated without apprehension; so that for the sake both of the voluntary and board schools, the Government were strongly urged to do something in the direction of what had been promised in 1870. The state of the case was this —The average cost per child was now 32*s.*, and the average Government grant was 13*s.* 8*d.*, which still left 18*s.* 4*d.* to be supplied locally; so that, taking the average of fees at the high figure of 10*s.* per annum, a considerable sum was still left to be supplied by voluntary subscriptions. I do not deny that the scheme proposed principally for the sake of the poorer districts — and they were very numerous in both town and country— is not a small matter, but the object in view is to meet and remove a grievous injustice. That injustice is not disputed. The more it is examined the greater it will appear to be. The burden of keeping up a school in Bethnal Green, or in a poor country village, is far greater in proportion than it is in more prosperous districts; but in proportion to the poverty of the school, the Government grant dwindles. I feel sure that so great a grievance cannot be left unredressed, and we have endeavoured to meet it in the broad way which the Committee has now approved, and I ask whether in the change we have made there is not complete security that, as a matter of fact, the rich districts would have, in most cases, considering the figures I have just quoted, to supply still a large amount of local subscription? It was a mistake on the part of the noble Lord to say that this was a complete change as compared with the Act of 1870. The noble Lord seemed to be under the impression that under that Act schools were obliged to have subscriptions to meet the Government grant. That is not so, and I have before shown in detail, during these discussions, that a considerable number of schools are self-supporting, that is to say, are maintained wholly by the children's fees and the Government grant without any sub-

iptions, and a larger number pro-
bly almost self-supporting, of which
great proportion belong to the Non-
formist bodies. So far, therefore, as
nciple is concerned, there is no
ange whatever. We have been boldly
d, as if it was an indisputable fact,
t the schools could no longer be con-
ered voluntary schools. I deny al-
gether the soundness of the basis, and
supposed facts upon which the argu-
nt is rested. I have shown already,
ing the high average all round of a
yment per child in fees of 10*s.* per an-
m, that owing to the great increase
the cost of schools, even where the
ildren do well at the inspection, there
ust remain a very considerable margin
money in the great majority of cases
be supplied by voluntary subscrip-
ons. But even supposing there was
t, do hon. Gentlemen forget, and count
r nought, the invaluable personal
rvices of the promoters and managers
voluntary schools? Do they think the
nnual maintenance and reforms of the
hools are nothing? Further, still, do
ey overlook the enormous amount of
pital that has been sunk in the schools
-£13,500,000 spent voluntarily on the
hool buildings, to which the State
ad added only some £1,735,000?
f the entire £15,250,000, no less than
13,500,000 had come out of the pockets
f the volunteers! Surely the possessors
those valuable schools have a right to
e considered in this matter, and also in
irtue of these invaluable contributions
the education of the people. Surely
ey have a most valid claim to have
hese schools accounted as voluntary
hools, ranking in a different category
rom those bought or built and main-
ained by the rates alone? I will not
ow allude to the special moral and
ocial advantages of these schools, as
ell as to the gain to the community
f having a variety in their schools, be-
ides the healthy competition which is
ept up by these different sorts of schools.
pon all these points, if the question of
he voluntary system is really raised, a
reat deal will be found to be said of a
ery weighty character. But, consider-
ng the light and jaunty way in which
ome hon. Members treat the question
f the maintenance of our great system
f voluntary schools, I should like to
all attention to the serious pecuniary
ifficulty in which the House would find

itself if they were to get rid of this system, which now was, as a matter of fact, part of the national life. The school board schools, numbering nearly 2,000, had involved an expenditure of £6,500,000, and they afforded accommodation for 550,000 children, being an expenditure of £11 10*s.* per head, as against £5 10*s.* in the case of the voluntary schools now numbering some 17,300, with accommodation for over 2,772,000 children. If by sane legislation voluntary schools were destroyed, I want to know what the noble Lord proposes to do to find school houses for the 2,772,000 children now accommodated in the voluntary schools. Does he propose to confiscate these buildings to the State? He cannot, for no private property would then be safe. Does he propose a forced sale? Is he prepared to oblige the ratepayers to supply the £13,500,000, which the volunteers have spent upon them? in addition to the £6,500,000 already imposed upon them by board schools? or would he charge them on the Imperial funds? but surely the £13,500,000 required would rather upset the Budget of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. All this goes to prove, I think it must be now agreed, that every consideration both economical, educational, and social, shows that the State ought to show every regard for the managers who possess this great body of voluntary schools, who keep them up, and give in many cases, from their personal interest in, and knowledge of, education, what no merely State system can secure, their time and their care—more valuable than any money. This management would be valued every day more by the parents, as it became known more and more by experience that the weak point of the rate-supported board schools is, and is likely to be, the management of their schools. Then, to go on with the Resolution, it proceeds to connect in some mysterious way the clause of the hon. Member for South Leicestershire, accepted by the Government and the Committee, which provides for the dissolution of unnecessary school boards, with a check to schools themselves—it says it will "impede the formation of new schools!" How, I cannot make out. Really, as in the former parts of the Resolution, the noble Lord is very much astray on this matter also. The noble Lord says that everybody will represent school boards as unnecessary; but he could not have read the clause of my hon. Friend the Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), for if he had he would have seen that it referred to school boards which had no schools and no sites, and these boards could only possibly be 500, but it was more likely the number would be under 200. The real position of the Government as to that clause was this—they did not feel bound to make the proposal if the subject was not mooted, as they did not think it necessary to put in their Bill all the various improvements into our education system, however desirable they might be in themselves; but the moment they were brought face to face with it—and it was brought before them from various parts of the country as well as in the House—they saw they could not decline to consider it, and on considering it their opinion was that there was no tenable argument which could be urged against it. The noble Lord had said that the Amendments which the Government had adopted would impede the formation of new schools; but here, again, a little more consideration would have shown the mistake into which he had fallen. As the law stood at present, no school board could build a school unless it was needed in the locality; so that, under the Amendment of the hon. Member for South Leicestershire, no alteration which impeded the formation of new schools was made, because, although the school board might have been dissolved, the Department would retain and exercise the power exactly the same as before, and as at this moment under the Act of 1870 to order the erection of schools in all places where it could be shown that they were needed. With regard to the transference of schools, the course was equally clear. If any governing body of a private school wished to hand over their school to a public body, they had only to close the school, and if the necessary accommodation was not supplied forthwith a school board would and must be established by the Education Department to supply the want. I think then I have shown that this part of the Resolution has as little foundation in fact as the preceding portions. The noble Lord goes on to urge in his Resolution that the changes made in the Bill will introduce discord and confusion into the election of school boards. How the possible dissolution of unnecessary and inefficient boards can effect this result I cannot imagine, nor has the noble Lord enlightened us in his speech — and no other change we have accepted can even remotely affect elections of boards. On the contrary, the only change as to the election of school boards which we ourselves proposed is the one by which bye vacancies are to be filled up by the boards themselves — a great boon to large towns specially, as saving them unnecessary expense and election excitements. If we had accepted the proposals coming from the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) and from others of the noble Lord's Friends, who desired to place the management of schools in the hands of Town Councils and Boards of Guardians and to give them all the powers of school boards, we should indeed have introduced discord and confusion with all the religious difficulty into the elections, not of school boards, but of every leading municipal and local authority in the Kingdom. Happily, however, the Government and the Committee refused to entertain these disastrous suggestions —so I think this part of the attack also falls to the ground. The noble Lord, in conclusion, had laid great stress upon the point that by changes in the Bill, the management of the schools was allowed to be in the hands of persons who did not contribute to the maintenance of the schools, and were not elected to the positions of governors; but this might and did occur under the Act of 1870, and I do not think the state of things will be much altered by the provisions of the present Bill. And as to these schools not being under public control, they were under a much greater control than mere local control—their whole curriculum of study, the whole of their arrangements were, in fact, under the control of the Education Department—and they could hardly stir to the right hand or to the left without the assent of the Code or of one of Her Majesty's Inspectors. The State certainly had full control over all the schools, voluntary and board just alike, which received her grants, and took good care at this moment that the money was spent for purposes she desired. It is a mistake to suppose that the present Bill will prevent the establishment of school boards in localities where they re desired by the inhabitants, or that he Government had done anything to revent them—and I must remind the oble Lord that he entirely refused to ountenance or accept the Amendments f my hon. Friends the Members for ury and Newcastle, which proposed to revent localities which had sufficient chools from having boards if they de- red. I have been so frequently taxed f late with being hostile to school oards, because when hon. Members hose to say that they were so generally ked by the country, and were so excel- ent, and that therefore it was a kind of acrilege to allow localities to get rid of nnecessary ones, I felt bound to say hat the printed official Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors and other public ocuments, if I was obliged to quote hem, would show that not a few boards were not efficient instruments for educa- ion, and that the feeling of the country was, in many parts, against them. I can, however, assure the noble Lord that I have no desire to run down school boards as an institution, and I have, as the House remembers, on many occasions defended them here against attacks from various quarters. But as my position towards, and opinion of, school boards has been so much misrepresented and has been alluded to by the noble Lord, I had, perhaps, better frankly state what my views are respecting them after the official knowledge of the last two years and a-half. I believe that in the large towns the school boards are generally doing an admirable work, and that they are mostly free from that sectarian atmosphere of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright) has spoken so bitterly as pervading school boards in general, and in which he said, as I formerly quoted, no good thing could thrive. In towns of medium size the school boards are frequently doing good work; but it must be admitted that in these places cases occurred, more often than they could have hoped, in which the board seemed to think more of sectarian differences than of the education of the people. As far as school boards in small rural districts are concerned, the system has, to a considerable extent, broken down, partly owing to the fact that the smallness of the areas made it impossible to get fitting people to act as members of the boards. This, then, is my opinion of the working of school boards, which I think it only right, after the noble Lord's remarks, that I should place at the disposal of the Committee. I believe now I have gone over all the points of the attack of the noble Lord, and I flatter myself that the Committee will agree with me that the matters in which the noble Lord blamed the Government have been fairly proved to be without foundation—so that nothing remains now but to accept the more agreeable part of the noble Lord's speech, in which he gave an evidently sincere approval of the Bill as a whole. The Government has throughout endeavoured to look at the question from the point of view of the interests of the children of this country, and I have a full confidence that those who look at it in this way, and not with a view to any bye objects, will give it an increasingly hearty approval. If, however, hon. Gentlemen opposite choose to take up the position of being the advocates of universal school boards, the Government will be glad to meet them on that issue before the country, and will willingly await the general judgment on this ground. If, further, they wish to stand forward before England as those who insist upon retaining school boards in places where two-thirds of the inhabitants have stated, and the Education Department has affirmed, that no board is any longer wished for or is necessary for purposes of education, I certainly will not grudge them this strange satisfaction. If they wish to appear as the opponents of that relief to the poorer schools, and that impulse to education generally, which our removal of the present vexatious restrictions upon the Government grant will afford, at the entreaty of many of the most experienced friends of education, it is not for me to ask them to forbear. And if, beyond all this, the noble Lord thinks it wise that his Party should be considered the enemies and assailants of a great national institution like the voluntary school system, which has struck its roots deep in every community, I cannot interfere with, nor do I apprehend the results of, their policy. We shall leave them willingly to settle these matters with the schools, with the ratepayers, and with their countrymen generally, and can only trust for their sakes they will find their self-chosen position a useful and beneficial one. For my own part, I sincerely believe and earnestly hope that the action of the Government has been that which is best calculated to promote the sound education of the whole country. We have kept steadily in view the great and important object of maintaining the freedom and responsibility of the parents as much as is consistent with the welfare of the children, and of interfering as little as possible with the habits and necessities of honest industry; and I can truly say that, in all the dealings of the Government with this great and most important but difficult question, we have looked principally to what was, to the best of our belief, for the good of the children, and for the continued honour, happiness, and welfare of our common country.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) was altogether wrong in supposing that after a Bill had passed the second reading, no Amendments, except such as referred to points of detail, could be introduced in it. The Amendment, therefore, of the noble Marquess must be rejected, for if such a doctrine were once allowed to prevail all proceedings in Committee upon Bills would become practically useless. Why did not the Nonconformists do as the Roman Catholics did? The Roman Catholics built schools for their own children; why did not the Nonconformists, who were a more wealthy body, do the same? The Roman Catholics considered the Conscience Clause a sufficient protection, and he was at a loss to conceive why it was not so considered by the Nonconformists. ["Divide!"] He considered that to compel children to learn by forbidding them to work was a mistake. Children should before all be educated to be useful and earn something for the family. This was even better than the three R's. It would be wiser to provide that children shall go to school at certain hours and under certain conditions, and interfere as little as possible with their useful employment. The education of the poorer classes ought to have reference to their useful employment and earning a living. But education—especially of girls—was now sometimes calculated to make them too proud to work. Thus it was very difficult to obtain domestic servants. How would it be under this Bill? It would be easy to provide for children of decided talent a higher education. With regard to school boards, the Department would not allow any school board to be dissolved which it might be necessary for the cause of education to maintain. Now, he wished to say nothing against school boards, for there was no doubt however they might have worked in some cases, in others they had done well. At the same time, he could not understand the indignation felt by hon. Members at the idea of touching a school board as if it were a sacrilege to do so. It was not zeal for education, but for education without religion, which animated the strong opposition which was now given. The question with those Gentlemen was not whether school boards were or were not the best means of educating the country, but whether secular education was to be indefinitely extended. The country, however, had come to the conclusion that denominational education was best, and it was for giving children that education which would make them when they grew up useful citizens and loyal subjects of the Crown.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, the House was very anxious to divide, and he would not detain them more than two or three minutes; but so many allusions had been made by hon. Members in the course of these discussions and by the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council that evening to the Act of 1870, that he might be pardoned for saying that it was distinctly on account of the relations of this Bill to that Act, and of the changes made in it, that he felt called upon to vote for the protest made by his noble Friend. He would not for a moment attempt to give a history of all the controverted questions raised at the passing of the Act of 1870; but he thought it would be acknowledged by both Parties that the Government of that day had, along with a sincere desire, a difficult task in hand—to do all they could for the improvement of education. In doing that they acknowledged the existing schools, and while saying that they were not sufficient to meet the educational want, they proposed the system of rate-aided schools. Consequently, when the Bill of 1870 became an Act of Parliament it had two systems; it worked with the voluntary system, supported by denominational energy; and with the rate system, relying on the principle of elected bodies taking care of the education of the locality. No one could doubt, and he was himself perfectly aware, that it was a difficult matter to get these two systems worked together. He would not detain the House with reasons for that; but they had passed an Act which, after much discussion, kept these two principles side by side as it were to take care of themselves. On one hand, the denominational school had denominational zeal to support it; on the other hand, there was the possibility that a rate would be a danger to voluntary schools, because a man disliked giving a subscription to relieve another man's rates. Every one who remembered the discussions must be aware of the forces and principles brought into action. Parliament passed the Bill with the understanding that each of these forces and principles was to take care of itself and do what it could in the matter of education, and he thought it was a mistake of the Government now to introduce any change which would supply to any extent the want of denominational energy and zeal by any additional State aid. The noble Lord in his opening speech stated—and he had not the slightest doubt of the fact—that the object of his Bill was to meet the attendance difficulty and get the children into school. On that side of the House he (Mr. Forster) and those who were with him had differed to some extent with the noble Lord in his mode of meeting the difficulty; but, at the same time, they fully acknowledged and appreciated his intentions. He would not go through the differences which existed between the advocates of direct and of indirect compulsion, but he was free to admit that the Bill in its progress had been very much changed, and changed for the better, so far as regarded the educational part of it. They had made several important changes in it. The noble Lord said that there had been three important debates on the subject; but there were only two, because he did not think the debate on the second reading lasted three minutes. There were great changes which he considered were to the advantage of the measure. It had been declared legally to be the duty of the parent to educate his child, and the 7th, now the 8th, clause as altered was almost as powerful as the bye-laws of the London School Board, inasmuch as it enabled work and school to go on well together. But all these changes, although they were, as he had said, for the better, appeared to him to be strong arguments why the Government should not have altered the relations between the school-board system, the rate system, and the voluntary system. There was no doubt that in order to meet the educational difficulty something had to be done by the Government which was a blow at the rate system. Many hon. Members on that side of the House would have preferred to meet the attendance difficulty by universal school boards, but even those who were most strongly in favour of that mode of meeting it were aware that it was hardly possible for the Government, after the debates and divisions of the last two years, to have made that proposition. At the same time there could be no doubt that while the establishment of new authorities and school boards, and giving them the power to sweep the children into the schools, was very necessary for the cause of education, and could not perhaps be avoided, yet in itself it was a great blow to the rate system as compared with the voluntary system, and a great boon to the denominational system. This was not because it was intended to confer an advantage upon denominational schools, but because they could not make progress in education without it. But the Government ought to have recollected that there were very many persons who would consider the step they took in the interests of education was disadvantageous to them. They ought not, therefore, to have altered the settlement of 1870 as between the two classes of schools. He would not for a moment say that there was anything in the Act of 1870 that ought never to be changed, but he did say that the compromise, or the relations between the two systems and the two principles, had been arrived at after very great discussion and difficulty, and it was most unwise on the part of the Government in any way to change it. The changes introduced by the Government, in his opinion, had this effect. One of them discouraged school boards, and the other encouraged denominational schools. The clause which looked forward to the dissolution of school boards, although minimized and frittered down by the week's debate, was, he thought, still a discouragement to school boards, and he thought that the clause which enabled a large number of schools to be conducted without voluntary subscriptions was a great encouragement to denominational schools. He believed it was unwise for the Government to have made that change, and although he agreed with the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council in his opening remarks, and although he would not have voted positively against the third reading, so as to get rid of the Bill entirely, because he believed that it was an educational step in advance, yet he did think it was their duty to put on record their protest against the change being introduced at this time. He did not wish to be misunderstood. He believed that this was a great encouragement to voluntary schools; but he thought it would eventually do them more harm than good. The noble Lord said there were schools in this particular position under the Act of 1870. It was quite true, but there were very few of them. Under the present Bill there would be a great many more, and especially in those places where there was likely to be most opposition to having voluntary schools without voluntary subscriptions. He was quite sure that the Government and their Supporters would one day regret that they had put denominational schools in the position of being sham denominational, instead of real denominational schools. He could not do otherwise than vote for the Motion of his noble Friend.

Lord JOHN MANNERS thought the conclusions advanced by the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) had been so satisfactorily met by the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council that the House might without difficulty have proceeded at once to a division. Replying to the remarks of the right hon. Member for Bradford, he would admit, as the right hon. Gentleman had stated, that he found himself in great difficulties in 1870 with respect to the conflicting claims of the voluntary and national systems, but those who then sat on the front Opposition Bench did all they could to enable him to get over those difficulties, and the course pursued on some occasions by the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues was not altogether a fair return for the facilities that were then afforded to him. If there were difficulties in passing the Bill of 1870 were there no difficulties six years afterwards in endeavouring to cure the defects and supply the wants in the practical operation of that Act? These difficulties they had to encounter during the present Session of Parliament, and he thought they might have appealed to the right hon. Gentleman and his Friends for a little more consideration and aptitude to assist them during these protracted debates. His noble Friend had to meet the great attendance difficulty, and the right hon. Gentleman must admit that that difficulty had been met in a manner to which little objection could be made. It was said that changes had been made, one of which would have a tendency to discourage school boards in general, but it was only where the facts of the case proved that school boards were unnecessary for the purposes of education that the clause of his hon. Friend would apply. The other change, it was said, would have the effect of encouraging denominational schools. He had yet to learn that such a charge should be fatal to any measure that it would encourage a system of education in the country which by every test that could be applied had proved to be the system which most accommodated itself to the feelings, wishes, and convictions of the people. It was very much on that ground that he hoped the House of Commons would ratify by no inconsiderable majority the stage at which the Bill had now arrived.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 182; Noes 120: Majority 62.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered.*

On the Motion of Viscount Sandon, the following clauses were *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill:—

Page 9, after Clause 19, to insert the following clause:—

(Returns of registrars of births and deaths to School Boards.)

"Every registrar of births and deaths, when and as required by a School Board, shall transmit, by post or otherwise, a return of such of the particulars registered by him concerning deaths and births of children as may be specified in the requisition of the School Board.

"The School Board may supply a form, approved by the Local Government Board, for the purpose of the return, and in that case the return shall be made in the form so supplied.

"The School Board may pay out of the school fund to the registrar making such return such fee as may be agreed upon between them and the registrar, not exceeding two pence for every birth and death entered in such return."

Page 11, after Clause 24, to insert the following clause:—

(Power of officer of local authority to enter place of employment.—See 30 and 31 Vic. c. 146, s. 9.)

"If it appear to any justice of the peace, on the complaint of an officer of the local authority acting under this Act, that there is reasonable cause to believe that a child is employed in contravention of this Act in any place, whether a building or not, such justice may by order under his hand empower an officer of the local authority to enter such place at any reasonable time within forty-eight hours from the date of the order, and examine such place and any person found therein touching the employment of any child therein.

"Any person refusing admission to an officer authorised by an order under this section, or obstructing him in the discharge of his duty, shall for each offence be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds."

MR. M'LAREN moved to insert the following clause after Clause 48:—

PART II.

Application of the Act to Scotland.

"In the application of this Act to Scotland, the following provision shall have effect:—The words 'so much of section ninety-seven of The Elementary Education Act, 1870, as enacts,' shall be construed as if the words were, 'The Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, and the Parliamentary grants made under the same, by minutes of the Scotch Education Department in force for the time as enact,' and that Clause 47 as thus varied and interpreted shall apply to Scotland."

Clause 47 contained three provisions to which he wished to call attention. One was with reference to the grant of 17*s.* 6*d.*, which applied to England, and not to Scotland; another was that in a small parish of 300 people, a grant of £10 might be made in addition to the grant for school fees; and the third was that in still smaller parishes where there were only 200 people, there should be a grant of £15 in addition to that earned by the children. Neither of these provisions were to apply to Scotland. Well, he need not tell the House that in Scotland there were a large number of parishes which were very thinly populated, and he thought that, taking into consideration the relative position of the two countries, if there was an advantage to be given to one country or to the other it should be given to Scotland in preference to England. The noble Lord opposite the Vice President of the Council had undertaken that the change he (Mr. M'Laren) was now proposing should be effected by means of an alteration in the Privy Council Minutes, and had stated that as the measure would not come into operation before March, there was plenty of time to make the alteration in question. This would be sufficient with regard to the grant of 17*s.* 6*d.*, but he very much doubted whether any Minute could provide for the other two special grants. If it could be done with reference to Scotland, it could be done with reference to England, and as an enactment was required for the latter, he did not see why there should not be an enactment for the former. All experience showed that Scotch legislation was pushed back to the last days of the Session, promise after promise had been made by the Government, and yet there had not been a single Scotch measure of any importance passed, nor was there likely to be one. Assuming for the sake of argument that all that was necessary to be done in the interests of Scotland in the matter of this Bill could be done next Session by Minute or Act of Parliament, he still thought that it should be all done this Session by adopting his clause.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, that the proposal was a very reasonable one, and the Government had great pleasure in accepting it. Scotland had a right to be placed in the same position—*mutatis mutandis*—as England.

Clause *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

MR. BOORD moved the following new clause:—

(No prosecutions to be undertaken except with the authority of at least two members of a School Board, School Attendance Committee, or Local Committee.)

"No legal proceedings for non-attendance, or irregular attendance at school, shall be commenced in a court of summary jurisdiction, by any person appointed to carry out the compulsory bye-laws of a School Board or Local Authority, except by the direction of not less than two members of a School Board, School Attendance Committee, or Local Committee, who shall have previously investigated the circumstances under which it is proposed to take such action."

He said that its sole object was to provide that due care should be exercised in dealing with defaulting parents under the stringent powers conferred by the Education Acts. The clause was in perfect harmony with the intention of the Act of 1870, and of the Bill at present before the House. It was also in accord with the professed policy of the London School Board, but unfortunately that policy, as expressed in a resolution passed in June, 1872, had not been acted upon. He wished again to disclaim any prejudice or opposition to school boards; as such, they had done good work, and he contended that, by the passing of this clause, their hands would be strengthened, and they would be enabled to recover some of the popularity they had notoriously lost in many places owing to the manner in which the compulsory bye-laws were enforced. He would remind the House that compulsion was new to Englishmen and opposed to their national instincts, besides which it was an interference with parental responsibility and the liberty of the subject; therefore, there was the more reason why, when justified by State necessity, it should be applied with moderation and discretion. It should also be borne in mind that recent educational legislation had completely inverted the traditions of our law in one important particular. Contrary to all precedent and practice in other matters, the person accused of a breach of the bye-laws of a school board was required to prove his innocence, an innovation that should be surrounded with safeguards to prevent injustice being done. Relying on the support he had already received, and feeling confident of the beneficial effect the clause would have, he begged now to propose it for the acceptance of his noble Friend the Vice President of the Council.

Viscount SANDON said, it was impossible to shut his eyes to the fact that the feeling of the Committee had been in favour of some such instruction. After much consideration the Government had determined to accept the clause with an Amendment. It would be necessary to insert the word "or" before "School Attendance Committee," and then let the clause stop there. He must decline to make it a condition that the members should themselves investigate the circumstances.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER did not think the clause necessary, because it represented the usual practice of the school boards. There had certainly been no dereliction of duty on the part of the London School Board, the members of which had, at a great sacrifice of time, personally examined into the circumstances before prosecutions were instituted.

Clause, as *amended, agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE proposed the following new Clause :—

"The managers of any school which is in receipt of an annual grant from the Education Department shall once in each year prepare an account in a form to be approved by the Education Department, showing in detail the income of such school from all sources, whether from Parliamentary grant, free schools, endowment, or voluntary subscription, and its expenditure, whether on salaries, school books, maintenance, or other miscellaneous expenditure; and such account, certified by two of the managers of the school, shall be kept in the school building, and shall be open to inspection by the parent of any child attending such school."

Clause (Statement of income of schools in receipt of an annual grant,)—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

Viscount SANDON said, he could not accept the clause. There was not now any reason for the public inspection of the school accounts that did not exist in 1870, when no provision of the kind was made. The accounts were sent up to the Department, and could, he imagined, be obtained in any special case, where information as to a particular school was desired, by any hon. Member who moved for them.

Mr. M'LAREN stated that the people in some rural places would look upon the money received by the school as a mine of wealth, and if they did not see how it was spent, all sorts of unfavourable rumours would be circulated. If they had a sheet of paper exhibited in the school in which all the accounts were entered, it would prevent these stories from getting abroad in the majority of cases, and where they did get abroad, it would be a most effectual means of putting them down.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 67; Noes 82: Majority 15.

Mr. CLARE READ moved an Amendment in Clause 5, to provide that a child at the age of 9 years might be employed at any suitable work if it had made 250 school attendances in each of the four previous years, and the same number of attendances since it had reached the age of 9, or if it had received a certificate fixed by Standard IV. of the Code of 1876. The hon. Member contended that the Amendment was much more needed now than when the Bill was first introduced, because the Government had since accepted an Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for the West Riding (Lord Frederick Cavendish), the effect of which was that a child over 10 years could work as a half-timer, however ignorant it might be. Strong boys and girls of 9½ years of age were very useful in agriculture during the summer months. The Amendment now proposed was in accordance with the spirit of the Bill, and he hoped the Government would accept it.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 25, after the word "years," to insert the words "unless the child, being of the age of nine years, had made two hundred and fifty school attendances in each of the four previous years, and, since it reached the age of nine years, made two hundred and fifty school attendances, or had received a certificate fixed by Standard Four of the Code of one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six."—(*Mr. Clare Read.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Viscount SANDON said, the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for the West Riding was accepted by the Government in deference to the marked feeling expressed on both sides of the House. The acceptance of that Amendment to which he had not concealed his personal dislike, as he feared it would seriously weaken the operation of the Pass system, and interfere with the effect of indirect compulsion, had, he confessed, somewhat complicated the position of the matter; but, on the other hand, the provision of the Bill was stringent that where a parent habitually neglected the education of his child, the stern arm of the law was to interfere, and the child was required to attend school a certain number of days. If local authorities did their duty no child would reach the age of 10 without having had a good deal of school attendance. Considerable concessions had already been made to his agricultural friends in regard to opportunities for children engaging in husbandry, and the Government felt they must adhere to the rule they had laid down—namely, that no child should go to work under the age of 10.

Mr. CLARE READ said, he would not press the Amendment in the absence of so many agricultural Members.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

On the Motion of Viscount Sandon, Amendment *made* in Clause 5, page 2, line 5, after "child," by inserting "being of the age of 10 years or upwards."

Other Amendments made.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH, in Clause 8, page 3, line 29, relating to children living on board canal boats, and who, from that circumstance, did not come within the comprehension of the Bill, requiring the attendance of children at the board schools, moved, after the word "attend," to insert, "but this excuse shall not be held to apply in the case of children living on board canal boats." The school boards had, the noble Lord observed, taken deep interest in those poor children, and he thought some provision ought to be made to secure their being educated.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 29, after the word "attend," to insert the words "but this excuse shall not be held to apply in the case of children living on board canal boats."—(*Lord Frederick Cavendish.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. W. E. FORSTER did not think the Amendment would do any harm, and hoped it would be adopted.

Viscount SANDON said, no one was more anxious than himself to meet the case of the poor canal children, but he thought the Amendment would, at this moment, do harm instead of good as the noble Lord desired, as the question was involved in such great difficulty. It would be almost impossible for the canal people to comply with its provisions, and therefore only useless irritation about education would be caused. How were they, living on board a canal boat, to attend a day school? The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had promised to deal with the matter next year, and therefore he hoped the Amendment would be withdrawn.

Mr. A. MILLS said, there were other classes of children with whom it was more difficult to deal, and in whose favour it was desirable that something should be done—he meant the children living on the shores of the river.

Mr. CLARE READ said, there were children living in barges upon navigable rivers as well as canals, for whose education something should be done.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, it was a question whether these children should be allowed to travel in canal boats at all, the cabins often being as overcrowded as the worst houses in London. As the Government were considering the whole questión, which would have to be dealt with on sanitary grounds, he trusted the noble Lord would not press the Amendment.

Mr. WHITWELL supported the view that the education of the classes of children referred to ought to be provided for.

Sir ANDREW LUSK said, there was another class of children that ought not to be neglected—he meant the gipsy children.

Mr. PELL said, the children of the best class of boatmen resided on shore, and they would come under the Act. The children of the worst class lived on board and were exempt from the operation of the law.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH, in consideration of these assurances, consented to withdrawn his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH, on Clause 13, moved to make the distance from school which should be an excuse for absence three miles instead of two.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 20, to leave out the word "two," in order to insert the word "three,"—(*Lord Frederick Cavendish,*) — instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the Bill."

Viscount SANDON said, he could not accept the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU moved an Amendment in the 14th Clause, to the effect that if the parent of any child resident in the district of a school board should be unable to pay any part of its fees at a public elementary school, and the school board fail to make regulations under Clauses 25 and 74 of the Act of 1870 for the payment of them, the Guardians, if satisfied of the parent's inability to pay, should pay the same, in accordance with the provisions of the section. The noble Lord said that his Amendment was directed towards an obvious injustice to poor parents, which he hoped the Government would remedy by adopting his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, line 17, after the word "pay," to insert the words "If the parent of any child who is resident in the district of a School Board is unable, by reason of poverty, to pay the fees of such child at a public elementary school, or any part of such fee, and if the School Board fails to make regulations, under Clauses twenty-five and seventy-four of the Elementary Education Act of 1870 for the payment of the same, it shall be the duty of the guardians, if satisfied of such inability, to pay the same in accordance with the provisions of this section."—(*Lord Robert Montagu.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the clause would interfere with the 25th clause of the Education Act of 1870, and as that clause had worked well, he would advise that it be let alone.

Viscount SANDON admitted that the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath had put his finger on a real grievance. There could be no doubt that Parliament did not intend that a parent should be obliged to send his child to a board school, if he objected to such school, simply because he was poor; and it was to be hoped cases of such injustice would not long exist. Perfect freedom to the parent as to the choice of school for his child was undoubtedly the intention of the Act of 1870, and it was only in cases where there was only one school available that Parliament had agreed to compel the parent to use a school which he did not like; and then only in the case where there was the Conscience Clause. Certainly poverty was never intended to be allowed to be held as a reason why the conscientious feelings of a parent were to be disregarded. He did not believe, however, that there were many cases in which it operated, or a very strong feeling would be manifested against it; neither could he think that Parliament intended that any school board should take upon itself only to remit fees and not to pay them. As the Amendment, however, in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Forster) would re-open the whole question of the famous 25th clause, he (Viscount Sandon) hoped it would not be pressed on this occasion. If it should be, he must oppose it.

MR. MELDON complained that the Irish Members were being sacrificed by the noble Lord's acquiescence in a suggestion from the Opposition, and he hoped the Government would re-consider their decision, and take steps to remedy an admitted grievance. Notwithstanding great pressure, and especially with regard to the division that night, the Irish Roman Catholic Members had supported the Government in all the debates upon the Bill; and their wishes, which were in favour of the Amendment, ought to be consulted. He was glad the subject of education was now in the hands of the present Government, and that the late Government would never have the power to influence it again in that House; for whenever they attempted to secularize education there would be 60, or 70, or 80 Irish votes given against them.

MR. BIRLEY declared that there was a good deal to be said in favour of the Amendment.

MR. CLARE READ supported the Amendment, because in all questions of poverty the Guardians rather than the school boards were the best authorities for the payment of the fees.

MR. SULLIVAN hoped the Government would see its way to deal with this admitted blot on the Education Bill. He would remind the noble Lord that the Irish Liberal Members had supported the Government in the manly stand which they had made for Christian education, not because they were enamoured of their general policy, but because they were a party of principle rather than a party of expediency. The poor Irish in the large cities and manufacturing districts of England were exactly the class most oppressed by the present state of things, and he urged the Vice President to accept the Amendment and take away the reproach.

MR. W. E. FORSTER repeated his opinion that the House would do well to let the 25th clause alone.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE trusted that the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council, having recognized that the Amendment was clearly equitable, would withdraw his objection to it. He should vote in its favour. After the noble Lord's candid confession that there was a grievance here, he could not see how hon. Members on the Conservative side could avoid voting with his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Sullivan).

MR. STEVENSON opposed the Amendment.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD, having admired the careful way in which the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council had piloted that Bill through shoals and quicksands, would be disposed to acquiesce in any decision of his; but the present case, he knew from personal experience, was so much one of justice, and intended to remedy what was a real blot in the law, that he hoped the Government would assent to the Amendment.

MR. ROWLEY HILL, speaking from his own experience as a member of a school board, maintained that the blot which the Amendment was intended to correct was not a real, but only an imaginary one. He believed that these poor children would be received into denominational schools even without the adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that his noble Friend (Viscount Sandon) had acknowledged that the demand made by the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath was, in its principle, founded on justice, although he doubted whether the practical working of the clause was such as to render it necessary or advisable that they should deal with the difficulty. Some hon. Gentlemen said that no difficulty had actually arisen, while others said that it had. On that point the affirmative evidence on the one side could not be rebutted by the negative evidence on the other; and it would be only fair and reasonable, therefore, that some provision should be made to meet it, and, under the circumstances, the Government would accept the Amendment, though they believed that there would not be many cases in which it would be really required to apply it.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH regretted extremely the statement just made. The acceptance of the Amendment simply meant making the 25th clause compulsory. Under that clause only some £3,000 or £4,000 a-year went to denominational schools in some favoured districts. Yet at the last Election nothing caused more excitement than that clause. As if the Bill did not trench closely enough on questions which went home to the hearts and consciences of the people, the Government seemed determined to excite them further by making the clause compulsory. He could only express his extreme regret that the Government should have accepted the clause, which he believed would excite more religious strife than any other that had been proposed.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY denied that the opponents of that Amendment were the only persons who had hearts and consciences, and urged that board schools were not intended to supplant but only to supplement denominational schools. The Amendment of the noble Lord had hit a blot in the Act of 1870, without in the least departing from the principle of the 25th clause of that Act.

Mr. J. COWEN said, the Amendment was the legitimate outcome of the 25th clause, and those who were in favour of that clause could not do otherwise than support the Amendment. From his point of view both the clause and the Amendment were equally objectionable. The consciences of parents had been referred to, but it should be borne in mind that many ratepayers had a conscientious objection to their money being applied to denominational education. The Education Act of 1870 was the means of dividing the Liberal Party and weakening them so that they were now not only a minority, but a disunited and disorganized minority. Hon. Members opposite, instead of speaking hardly of the Act of 1870, ought to congratulate themselves that it had been passed. "Once bit, twice shy." The Dissenters were bit by that Act, and they had been shy ever since.

Mr. WILBRAHAM EGERTON supported the Amendment, expressing his satisfaction that it had been accepted by the Government.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, he did not think the House ought to be called upon to divide upon an Amendment, the acceptance of which came upon them by surprise. It was true that the Act of 1870 weakened the Liberal Party, but he congratulated the Party that the Government were taking such strong steps to re-unite them. A clause had been already introduced into the Bill which practically involved what the Nonconformists hated very much—a scheme of concurrent endowment; and now this Amendment would weaken school boards by allowing Boards of Guardians in one respect to override them. This would rouse more bitter feeling in the country than the clause of the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell).

Mr. FAWCETT wished to protest in the strongest possible language against the Government. Not apparently warned by the time already wasted, they repeated their tactics up to the very last. An ominous summons from the Treasury Whip had brought up the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say that what some hours before was a theoretical difficulty was a practical difficulty, and to accept the Amendment making the 25th clause compulsory. In order to give the House an opportunity of discussing the Question in these new circumstances, he would move the Adjournment of the Debate.

Mr. DILLWYN seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

Sir WALTER BARTTELOT said, he was surprised at the proposal just made for the Adjournment of the Debate. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Lyon Playfair) had taunted the Government with doing their best to reunite the Liberal Party. After the speech just made by an hon. Member (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) the House would see upon the division whether the unanimity spoken of by the right hon. Gentleman existed nong the Liberal Party. He appealed the House to support the clause on e ground of the poor parent. Parliaent was now forcing education on the ople, and, if there were efficient schools a parish where a school board existed, rents had a right to say to what school eir children should go in all cases.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER thought his hon. iend (Mr. Fawcett) perfectly right in oving the Adjournment of the Debate. is was a most important clause, and no e could have expected that it would be ken up and adopted by the Government. e knew 50 or 60 hon. Members who ould have been in their places if they d supposed the Government would cept the clause. He warned the Gornment of the difficulties which the oposal would bring in its train. The pposition never could have expected at in this last stage of the Bill such a ause would be entertained. He was tirely opposed to the Guardians being t in over the school board.

Mr. RITCHIE said, that the clause d been put upon the Paper, and it was r the House and not for the Goverent to determine whether it should be lded to the Bill. If the 50 or 60 embers alluded to by the right hon. entleman opposite (Mr. Forster) were ot in their places to oppose a clause of hich due Notice had been given it was eir fault, and there was no reason why s consideration should be postponed. e represented a neighbouring constiency (the Tower Hamlets) to that of e hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. awcett), and he could say the clause ould be received with great pleasure y his constituents. He trusted the overnment would persevere in their ourse, and he should give them his earty support.

Mr. DILLWYN understood that the mendment had only been placed on e Paper on the previous evening; but, any case, there was a great difference etween a Notice being on the Paper nd its being accepted by the Goverent. He complained of that sudden udden change of front on the part of e Government, and hoped the House ould sit as long as it was necessary to nable the country to form an opinion n the question.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: I ask the noble ord the Vice President of the Council hether Boards of Guardians are to ave the option of paying these fees? ["No, no!"] Then I must say that I think it exceedingly objectionable that they should not; because it would be in the power of any parent to render Boards of Guardians subsidiary to any school which he might choose. I hope my hon. Friend below me is right, but I will take the case of a parish without a board school, but with a public elementary school to which the Board of Guardians may object. You cannot say to that authority—"If you do not like the school, erect another," for you have not given the Board of Guardians the power to do that. You say to them—"You shall pay to the school that exists, although you object to that school." Then I say that to make this compulsory is contrary to the whole principle of the Act, which renders the authority of the district responsible for the teaching for which it has to pay. The alterations in the terms of the code of this Bill appears to render it perfectly improper to make this payment obligatory without option on the part of the Guardians. That is a change which I hope has escaped the attention of the Government, and I for one shall certainly not vote for rendering Boards of Guardians subsidiary to any school in their district whether they choose it or not.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT thought the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) had hit the nail on the head. It would seem from the policy which the Government had pursued with respect to the measure that they were determined to have a new Education Bill every night. The noble Lord the Vice President of the Council had not learned wisdom from experience. It took him a week to carry the clause of the hon. Member for South Leicestershire, and perhaps that was worth while, because he thereby obtained the alliance of the hon. Gentlemen who supported the hon. Member. But the noble Lord had other allies in the Roman Catholic Members of that House, so well represented by the noble Lord behind him (Lord Robert Montagu), who had proposed a clause which might be described as an exaggeration of the old 25th clause. The old 25th clause gave an optional power to school boards to subscribe the fees payable by parents who sent their children to denominational schools; but it was now proposed to make it compulsory on them to do so. This was a complete overthrow of the Act of 1870 as far as regarded the 25th clause, and it was a complete change of the Bill of the Government, which did not interfere with that clause. The Amendment of the noble Lord only appeared on the Paper that morning, and within 12 hours afterwards it was adopted by the Government. It was a fresh attack on school boards, it was fatal to their authority, and intended to be destructive to those very school boards which the Vice President of the Council had eulogized. He did not complain of the course which the Catholic Members had taken; but he was surprised that his noble Friend, who was to a certain extent the representative of the Orangemen of Liverpool, should have entered into alliance with them on this matter. The whole theory of the Catholic Church was that education ought to be entirely in the hands of the priesthood. ["No, no!"] He was sorry if he had misrepresented the views of Catholics on that subject; but all he could say was, that the view of those who sat on the Liberal side was entirely the opposite; and one of the reasons why they desired to see the extension of school boards in this country was because school boards were essentially representative of the laity, and wherever they existed the authority of the laity to control the education of the people was effectually secured. He complained of the re-opening of that large question at the eleventh hour without any practical Notice to that House, and without any notice whatever to the country, and thought they would be only exercising their proper and legitimate functions in securing for the country ample time to consider the proposed change.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU observed that he had given Notice of his Amendment as soon as he had discovered the blot in the Bill, which he desired to remove. In moving it he did so on the broad ground of justice, and he had simply declared that they had no right to compel the poor people to send their children to schools for which they were unable to pay the fees, unless they secured in some way that the fees should be paid for them. There was only one Party which had been consistent throughout on this question, and that was the Irish Party. He thought, however, that if the Government had changed their opinions on the question it was owing to what they saw was the feeling of the House.

Mr. PELL said, the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) and the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) showed that they had not fully examined the proposals contained in the Bill. The principle of the clause under discussion, so far from being a new one, was contained in the 14th clause of the measure, and was also embodied in a Bill introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford in 1873—a Bill entitling Boards of Guardians to pay the school fees for out-door paupers, who also were privileged to select the schools to which their children should be sent.

Mr. SULLIVAN said, that if there had been any change of front on this question, it had been effected by the occupants of the front Opposition bench above the Gangway, whose right to taunt Her Majesty's Government with changing their front he begged emphatically to deny. On the question of shortness of Notice, he would remind the House that a deputation waited yesterday on the Leader of the Opposition, and that as the result of such deputation a formidable Notice of Motion appeared on the Paper that morning, side by side with that of the noble Lord's the Vice President of the Council's, which the House was then considering. That formidable Amendment was in the name of the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition; but those of the disunited Liberal Party who had counselled its adoption had no right to place themselves in antagonism to the Amendment of his noble Friend. He challenged the Leader of the Opposition to raise the question at issue on the broad platform of public approval. The hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen), one of the most advanced Radicals in the House, and one who knew the feeling of the country far better than the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), had said that anyone who would vote for the 25th clause would vote for the Amendment. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) complained that the clause would leave an option in the hands of the Guardians; but it was only an option to decide upon a question of poverty, and on such a subject he should think Boards of Guardians were likely to be the best judges. The hon. and learned Member for Oxford had very skilfully raised a false issue by ying that the question raised by the ause of the noble Lord was one between e laity, pure and simple, and those ho wished for clerical domination in ucational matters. He could only say at the Roman Catholic laity had no esire for clerical domination. They ly wished to have it known that, in eir opinion, an education divorced from oral ideas and conscientious principles -reverence for God and His teachings -might make skilful infidels, but would ever make good citizens. It was by eddling with education in a way that uched the consciences of Irish Members that hon. Gentlemen on the front pposition bench were forced out of ffice, and it was a little shortsighted of hem now to pursue a similar policy in n aggravated form. They were the ost inconsistent politicians in the world. n one breath they called for the demolion of the State Church, and in the next ney sought to cram down the throats of e people a new State religion in the chools. As the Adjournment was oved for the purpose of an out-door gitation, he warned the Liberal Party, who were not united upon this and other uestions, and who were glad in their urn to receive concessions from the Government, that if they went to the country upon this issue, the Government would stand before the country as saying that, while poverty had many hardships, t should not at all events have this additional aggravation—that while a poor man, as long as he could pay, was able o send his children to school in which is conscience was respected, his children should not, when he was no longer able o pay, be forced into a school from which his conscience rebelled.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said, that the Scotch Act contained a clause enabling poor parents to apply to the Parochial Board, who, thereupon, paid the cost of the schooling. This clause was on all fours with the Amendment of the noble Lord, and it was a clause proposed by the late Government.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 91; Noes 192: Majority 101.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, it could hardly be doubted that Her Majesty's Government would have refused to accept the Amendment had it been proposed by any other hon. Member, but it was impossible to forget the ties of almost intimate personal friendship which bound them to the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath. That circumstance had doubtless induced the Government to accept the Amendment with such haste. There was no reason whatever why the Amendment should not have been moved in Committee on the Bill, and as he objected to an Amendment of such a character being brought forward at so late a period of the Session, he begged to move that the House should now adjourn.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Mr. NEWDEGATE: I rise to ask a question. Having come into the House after the discussion of the clause had proceeded to some extent, I put a question to hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench, to which I have received no answer. I trust the House will now allow me to explain the reason of the vote which I have just given. As the clause stands the Guardians are compelled, if the parent is poor, and is resident in a district where there is not a school board, to pay the fees to any denominational school in the district to which the parent may choose to send his child; and the Amendment which is now proposed would render it compulsory on the Guardians, in a district where there is a school board and a board school, to pay the school fees for the child whose parent is poor, to whatever school the parent chooses to send his child, although the education of that child might be provided for in a board school. We are placed in this difficulty. Unfortunately, the House rejected the Amendment which was proposed by the hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Hall) the other night, which would have insured religious education in board schools for every child whose parent demanded it. The House has failed to provide religious education in the board schools. It is quite true that in the great majority of board schools religious education is given; and I regret that there should be any exceptions to the rule; still, in the board schools generally religious education is given. Now, I hold that that ought to be compulsory at the option of the parent, and I voted that it should be, but the Government rejected the proposal. What is the effect? Why, that the Roman Catholic Members rise to tell you that all the board schools are in principle secular. Whose fault is that? It is the fault of those who rejected the proposal that board schools should be compelled to give religious education when the parent demands it. That was a great mistake on the part of the Government and the House. It places the House in this position—that it has established secular without religious education, and the Roman Catholic Members take advantage of this. Of course they do. They represent the principle which is held by the Heads of their Church, that no religious education ought to be given except by the priesthood. ["No, no!"] That is the declaration of your own Episcopate. Well, we object to that principle; but, unfortunately, the House has failed to enforce the alternative—the alternative being that the parent should have a right to claim religious education in any public elementary school, maintained by public funds. The position of the Conservative Party is weak, because the principle of the clause proposed by the hon. Member for Oxford was rejected; but what is the position of the Government? Because, having opposed that clause, and placed themselves in a difficulty by opposing it, as they have given the Roman Catholic Members an opportuity of declaring all the board schools and union schools secular in principle, they are now proceeding on the principle of concurrent endowment. That is inevitable from their rejecting all religious education demanded by a parent in a board or other public elementary school. The other night I urged upon the Government the precedent set by the late Lord Derby in the year 1835, who, in instituting the national system of education in Ireland, provided for the religious education of the children as a part of the system. At the instance of Cardinal Cullen, when he first appeared as a Bishop in Ireland, in opposition to the decision of the late Archbishop Murray, that system has been abrogated in Ireland; but the power of the Cardinal Archbishop and the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in England is not yet what it is in Ireland, and if the Government had but acted in conjunction with their supporters when the hon. Member for Oxford proposed that religious education should be given in the public elementary schools to all children whose parents demand it, they would not have been placed in the position in which they now are, and in which they have placed their whole Party. Of course, as an independent Member myself, I do not feel bound to vote against my convictions. I desire to promote religious education, and I contend that it is the duty of the State to provide religious education for every child whose parent demands it in a public institution. That is an intelligible principle; but I am sorry to see that the principle on which the Government are proceeding is this—they have adopted the doctrine of religious indifference in the sense of religious equality with respect to all the religions, the provision for which they are now about to enforce upon Boards of Guardians, and upon all school boards. I think this is a lamentable result; but it is the result of their having resisted their own supporters, when we asked the House to declare that the public authority should provide religious education for the children, whenever demanded by the parents, as was the case originally in Ireland. The position of the Government is, in my estimation, a false position, and I felt compelled in consequence to vote against them.

MR. GREENE believed there was now no course before the Government except that of approving of the Amendment of the noble Lord. Had they gone to a division in opposing the clause they would have been beaten by their own Supporters. For his own part—although he always looked with suspicion upon a Motion proposed by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Robert Montagu)—still on this occasion his prejudices had been overcome, and he had therefore voted against the Motion of the hon. Member for Hackney. Although he so disliked Roman Catholicism, he would rather see a child educated in a Catholic school than in a secular one.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 91; Noes 195: Majority 104.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES FORSTER said, that as it was impossible to finish the debate that night he would move the Adjournment of the Debate.

Mr. FARLEY LEITH seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he hoped the Government would consent to the Motion. ["No, no!"] The only result in not doing so would be that they would be engaged some considerable time that night in debating it, and which would not lead to a speedy or an amicable decision of that long education debate. There was not the slightest idea the question would have been brought before the House. It had been sprung upon them suddenly; and there was a minority sufficiently large to insist on more time for consideration. The proper course for the Government to take if they did anything in the direction intimated by the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath would have been rather to have repealed the 25th clause altogether, than to modify it by a proposal which would throw the whole working of the Act into confusion, besides taking from the ratepayers an option which they at present had, and doing that in a manner the most contemptuous and insulting. The clause was working tolerably well, and there was no reason why at the end of the Session it should have been re-opened.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER thought it was a great pity that they should be wasting all these hours, but at the same time he did not know what was to be gained by adjournment. As they had a full House, and the matter had been fully discussed, he thought they had better decide the question. It was not a new question; it had been before the country for many years, and the whole of the consequences involved had been made the subject of anxious consideration, and of argument both within and without the House. He could not consent to the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate.

Mr. MUNDELLA said, that an hour and a-half ago the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council declared that he could not accept the Amendment; but a quarter of an hour later the Chancellor of the Exchequer rose in his place and accepted it. He complained that the decision of the Government had been sprung upon them unexpectedly. He, however, exonerated the noble Lord from any double dealing in the matter. The Amendment had been pressed upon him against his own convictions. He (Mr. Mundella) contended that it would thrust the greatest possible indignity upon the school boards, for it involved the reversion of an important principle affecting their position, inasmuch as it would put the Board of Guardians over their heads. He believed it was the firm determination of hon. Members who had voted in the minority not to allow the question to be decided until the country had had an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon it. If the Government were going to deal in the politics of surprise, they would be surprised to find that they would not finish the Bill that Session.

Mr. PELL said, the Motion of the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath merely extended to the child of a poor man the same privilege as was given to the child of a pauper—namely, that in school-board districts the Board of Guardians should have power to send his child to school, though it left to the parent the choice of the school. He saw no reason why the clause should not be agreed to.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: I believe that Roman Catholic Members speak their own sentiments, but they do not speak the sentiments of those by whom their Church is governed. I am protesting against the State countenancing the principle of concurrent religious endowment. That is what I protest against. In December last a meeting was held at which Mr. Lilley, the secretary of a Roman Catholic institution established to form a connection between the Roman Catholic hierarchy in this country and Roman Catholic institutions abroad with respect to education, described the difference between the position of France and England, and he said this—

> "In France our course is simple, because the people do not see anything different between pure secularism and the Roman Catholic Church. The case in England is different. The people here are divided into various sects; but they are strictly and essentially a religious people. In England we have to contend with heresy. In France we have to contend with indifference."

In France the course is simple, but in England the principle of religion is implanted deep in the hearts of the people; but that feeling is not represented by the Government, who would, however, find a solution to this difficulty in accepting the principle of compelling the the board school and every public elementary school to give religious education whenever demanded by a parent, otherwise they will give to the Roman Catholic hierarchy the advantage of being able to denounce every board school and every union school as a secular establishment adverse to religion. They need no other position in order to produce in this country that which Mr. Lilley declared the Ultramontanes desired—Roman Catholicism on one side, and absolute religious indifference on the other. That is the position from which they look forward to success, and hope to achieve it; and the reason, assigned by themselves, why they have not become dominant in England, is the religious feeling of its people who now demand from this House the satisfaction of that feeling.

Dr. WARD, speaking as a Roman Catholic, said he would prefer to send his children to a Church school with a Conscience Clause rather than to a secular school.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK did not wish, after the divisions which had been taken, to press the Adjournment; but as there was this peculiarity in the matter, that the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Sandon) at first opposed the clause, it would be well that both the House and the Government should have further time for consideration.

Captain NOLAN denied that the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council at first disapproved the clause; on the contrary, the noble Lord said it was an excellent one, but in the absence of his Colleagues at the time from the Treasury Bench he hesitated to accept it.

Mr. HOPWOOD was somewhat astonished that the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council had not corrected, if an erroneous impression existed, the statement made to the effect that he had accepted the clause of the noble Lord.

Mr. BIRLEY denied that any such undertaking had been given. What the noble Lord said was that the Amendment hit a blot in the Bill which called for some remedy, but he hesitated to accept the clause, as he doubted the propriety of inserting it in the Bill.

Viscount SANDON observed that what took place was this—He said that the Government could not do otherwise than acknowledge that the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) had hit a blot in the Bill, but that there was every reason to suppose that the school boards would become more and more aware that they had not exercised their functions quite justly in the matter; that public opinion, when the matter was understood, would insist that parents should be dealt with justly in the matter, and that children should not be forced into board schools when the parents were too poor to send them to denominational schools. But he said that at that late period of the Session, after the remarks of the right hon. Member for Bradford, there was not sufficient cause to justify him in opening the question. There followed, however, a remarkable exhibition of feeling on both sides of the House—a strong feeling for which the Government was not prepared; and that made it desirable that the Government should reconsider the matter.

Mr. MELDON said, after the statement of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council positive evidence was given of the necessity of legislation in order to cure existing defects. He trusted hon. Gentlemen who thought they constituted the Liberal Party would be satisfied with the proof they had given of unification, and with having brought down the right hon. Member for Bradford as a repentant sinner.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 82; Noes 179: Majority 97.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. MUNDELLA said, it was quite impossible the debate should be closed that night. The clause had been accepted by the Government suddenly and without Notice, and no opportunity had been given for proposing Amendments. He begged, therefore, to move the Adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Mundella.*)

Mr. W. E. FORSTER supported the proposal for Adjournment.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 77; Noes 170: Majority 93.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. OSBORNE MORGAN moved the Adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Osborne Morgan.*)

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA expressed a hope that hon. Members would answer the arguments in favour of the Amendment, instead of resorting to the Forms of the House to defeat it. When the Irish Members did so to preserve the benefits of the Constitution for their country they were very much condemned for the course they pursued.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON was afraid the temper of the House was such as to render any appeal to hon. Members opposite perfectly useless. As there were Strangers in the Galleries he did not think that was an occasion on which the House appeared in the best light. But, on the other hand, he did not admit that the blame could fairly be attached to the Opposition benches. He contended that the Government were seeking to force upon the House an important Amendment, brought forward without Notice, that it formed no part of the original Bill, nor was it alluded to in Committee, and it was but reasonable that time should be allowed to consider it and see whether it could not be amended so as to make it less objectionable than it was in its present shape.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER observed, that the House was considering not a clause, but an Amendment—an addition to the 14th clause. The point was not a new one; it had been under consideration for years. The 14th clause provided for the payment of the fees of poor children in districts where there was no school board, and the Amendment extended that provision to school board districts, and the 25th clause of the Act of 1870 did not meet the case, as the option to pay the fees there provided was in many cases not given effect to. At the first blush the Government did not feel inclined to accept the proposal of the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath (Lord Robert Montagu), but since that time cogent reasons had been stated in support of the clause, and the Government felt bound to accept it. The principle involved in the clause had been so long discussed that he thought there could be no difficulty in arriving at a decision on the question. If the proposal for Adjournment was agreed to the House would re-assemble at 2 o'clock for the further consideration of the Bill with no additional information on which to found a decision.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR hoped further time would be given for further consideration of the clause before the House was called upon to come to a conclusion concerning it.

After further short debate—

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 72; Noes 160: Majority 88.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Blake.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 68; Noes 156: Majority 88.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. MONK protested against the Government springing a mine on the House, and moved the Adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." (*Mr. Monk.*)

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT proposed to move an Amendment on the clause to give the Government an opportunity, in a division, of asserting their view upon the subject as regarded the principle at issue, and with the object of deferring the consideration of further Amendments.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that if it was to be distinctly understood that the present decision was to be final as regarded the principle, so far, then, there could be no objection to giving a few hours' delay for further consideration with regard to Amendments; but if the whole question was to be re-opened when the House met again, why, better fight it out at once.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, the Government were willing to consent to some delay upon the terms suggested, on the distinct understanding that the division on the proposed Amendment was to be regarded as equivalent to a division on the second reading of the clause.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, on the part of other hon. Members, declined to be bound by the proposed arrangement, on the ground that it would involve the surrender of all that they had been contending for.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 64; Noes 153: Majority 89.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BRISTOWE, pointing to the lateness of the hour—a quarter to 3 o'clock—moved the Adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Bristowe.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON thought the Government were scarcely meeting the Opposition in a conciliatory spirit.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER considered that the Government had shown every disposition to meet the Opposition fairly.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 63; Noes 148: Majority 85.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 61; Noes 144: Majority 83.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 1, to leave out the words "who is," in order to insert the words "not being,"—(*Sir W. Vernon Harcourt,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'who is' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Viscount Sandon

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." (*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 57; Noes 140: Majority 83.

Question again proposed, "That the words 'who is' stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir George Balfour.*)

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

House adjourned at half after Four o'clock in the morning.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 4th August 1876.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Tralee Savings Bank * (202).

Second Reading—Juries Procedure (Ireland) (196); Poor Law Rating (Ireland) (197); Exhausted Parish Lands * (186).

Report—Winter Assizes * (200).

JURIES PROCEDURE (IRELAND) BILL.

(*The Lord President*).

(NO. 196.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was a measure of the greatest importance to Ireland, which had already passed through the other House. It was based on the recommendations from a Select Committee of the House of Commons that sat in 1874 to inquire into the jury system in Ireland, and its object was to give effect to such of those recommendations as had not been embodied in a previous measure, which was passed through both Houses of Parliament at an earlier period of the present Session. The noble Duke concluded by moving the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President.*)

Lord O'HAGAN: I desire to offer my best support to the measure introduced by the noble Duke. It is a supplement to the Bill which I carried through your Lordships' House in 1870. I have therefore felt much interest in it, and I have considered its provisions. It fairly fulfils the recommendations of the Committee of the House of Commons, and will be of signal advantage to the public. The Act of 1870 has been the subject of much hostile criticism and some unscrupulous assaults. It has been attacked as to its principle and as to its details, especially as to the amount of the jurors' qualification. Now, on that matter I may say a word. The Bill of 1870, as introduced into this House, was framed with a desire to make the rating qualification, although only a very rude and insufficient measure of intelligence, as high as might be consistent with the supply of a sufficiency of jurors. After long consideration it was passed unanimously by your Lordships; but, when it went to the House of Commons the qualification was reduced, and the Bill must have been lost if the reduction had ot been accepted here, so that, if injury arose in that regard, and it became necessary to make such an alteration as has now been effected, the fault was not with the action of this House or of the author of the measure. As to the principle of the Act, I congratulate the Government on the firmness with which it has been maintained in its full integrity. I never dreamt that the measure was perfect or hoped that it would work perfectly at once. I knew that the English jury system, although coeval with the Constitution, accordant with the genius of the people, and cherished by them as one of their proudest national possessions, is still admitted by them to need great improvement, and that year after year Parliament has been endeavouring to improve it. The experiment in Ireland was novel as it was difficult. The Act of 1870 wrought, in a sense, a social revolution. It opened the jury box to classes who had for generations been jealously precluded from any interference with the Courts of Justice. It took away the mischievous discretion with which official persons had been accustomed, sometimes honestly, sometimes capriciously, and sometimes corruptly, to manipulate the panels at their good pleasure, and put an end, for ever, to the notorious packing which so often made trial by jury a scandal and a farce. A change so great could not be accomplished without exciting susceptibilities, arousing prejudices and alarming vested interests, and, accordingly, there was an outcry, loud and long—an outcry, official and political—which found a pretence of justification in the conduct of jurors for the first time called to discharge one of the highest, as it is one of the most difficult, functions of a free citizen, and in some instances necessarily committing errors and absurdities from which even the training of centuries does not enable their brethren of England always to escape. Of these absurdities and errors the most was made. Ridicule, abuse, exaggeration, were employed without measure or mercy, and the real effort was to reverse the principle of the law. All this has failed. The Government have done well and bravely in refusing to touch that principle or permit the licence of the sheriff again to bring justice into suspicion and contempt. They have amended the Act by raising the qualification and adopting administrative changes which experience has shown to be desirable, and which all reasonable people approve; and, with the help of this measure, there is every reason to hope that the Act of 1870 will work efficiently and satisfactorily. I need not particularly refer to the provisions which have been clearly summarized by my noble Friend; but I specially approve those by which I trust jurors of station and wealth in Ireland will be compelled to do the duties which, in spite of repeated remonstrance and rebuke from the bench, they have too much abandoned to their humbler colleagues. This is a great public evil and the redress of it will go far to rectify any shortcomings of the present action of the law; of which I had hoped that one of the results would be the harmonious combination of men of various classes in the discharge of a great public trust—of equal interest to them all—with beneficial consequences to the order of society and the administration of justice. I trust your Lordships will give a second reading to this Bill.

Motion *agreed to*.

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committed of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

POOR LAW RATING (IRELAND) BILL.

(*The Lord President.*)

(NO. 197.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, there had been for some time in Ireland considerable difference of opinion on the Poor Law rating as to its chargeability. Some persons held that the proper mode of rating was by a general Union rate, while others were equally confident that the rating should be on the electoral division. A Committee on the subject sat in the other House of Parliament, and the Members of it were so evenly balanced in opinion that the Report was, he believed, only passed by the casting vote of the Chairman. This Bill, of which he now moved the second reading, might be considered as a compromise between the two extreme opinions upon the subject, and it made the chargeability of a pauper to the electoral division dependent on a residence of four years instead of two, and that there should be a six instead of a twelve months' notice.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President.*)

LORD EMLY expressed an opinion that the Bill would work exceedingly well.

Motion *agreed to*.

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT.

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS.

EARL GRANVILLE (on behalf of Viscount HALIFAX) moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Despatch from the Government of India, 72 Public, of 24th December 1874; Copies of any dissents to the despatches of the Secretary of State of 31st May 1876, recorded by Members of the Council of India.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK said, that if, after having carefully considered the Correspondence relating to the Indian Tariff Act of 1875, which was already in their Lordships' hands, he had felt there had been any serious divergence of views between his noble Friend the Secretary of State for India and himself, he should have been reluctant to trouble them on the subject, and should at all events have abstained from making any observations upon it until the Papers for which his noble Friend (Earl Granville) had just moved, which were simply a continuation of those to which he had referred, had been produced, and until the House had the advantage of the presence of his noble Friend (Lord Lawrence), whose speedy restoration to health they all looked forward to with satisfaction, as well as of his noble Friends (Viscount Halifax and the Duke of Argyll), both of whom had for many years filled the office of Secretary of State for India. As, however, he hoped and believed that no material difference of opinion existed between the noble Marquess opposite and himself; and, as he would studiously avoid touching on any topic likely to lead to controversy, while he was anxious to place a very important question upon a more satisfactory footing than that upon which it at present stood, he hoped the House would not think he was wrong in making the few remarks which he was about to address to it. Their Lordships would recollect that in November last certain instructions were addressed by the Secretary of State to the Government of India relative to the removal of the Customs duty of 5 per cent upon cotton manufactured goods imported into that country. That despatch, which was dated the 11th November, 1875, contained also some observations as to the manner in which the Indian Tariff Act of 1875 had been passed, and it moreover gave to the Government of India certain instructions with respect to the manner in which communications should pass between the Government of India and the Secretary of State upon the subject of contemplated legislation for India. It had been laid on the Table of the House, and had given rise to a discussion in the early part of the Session. Since that time further Papers had been placed in their Lordships' hands, and it was on those Papers he desired to make some observations. They contained the replies of the Government of India, dated the 25th of February and the 17th of March, to the despatch of the Secretary of State of the 11th of November, and two answers from the Secretary of State to those replies, dated the 31st of May. As to the observations which were made by the noble Marquess with respect to the manner in which the Indian Tariff Act of 1875 had been passed, he desired not to say a single word, as the whole matter was fully discussed in the official despatches from the Government of India which had been laid on the Table. The question, so far as he (the Earl of Northbrook) wished to call attention to it, in connection with the instructions of Her Majesty's Government, stood as follows:—The Government of India, in considering whether it was possible for them to propose to the Indian Legislature a measure which would give up a very large and productive source of revenue — amounting to something like £800,000 per annum—were obliged to take into account the position of the finances of India, and upon the best consideration which they could give at that time—which was in February last —to the matter, they felt it would be impossible for them to sacrifice so large an item of revenue while there was a large increase of charge impending in consequence of the depreciation of the value of silver which then existed — a depreciation which had since, he need hardly remind their Lordships, become much more serious than it then was. The Government of India, under those circumstances, replied to the Secretary of State, that it would be impossible, in their opinion, in the condition of the finances of India at the time, to remit the duties to which he referred; and when, he might add, they deliberated on the despatch from the Secretary of State of the 11th of November, it was not quite clear to them whether it was intended or not that new taxes of some description should be imposed to meet the deficiency which would be created by the removal of the Customs duty on cotton manufactures. Upon that subject they entertained a very strong opinion, and he could not express it more clearly than it had been expressed in a passage in the despatch from the Government of India of the 25th of February last—

> "We feel it to be our duty to represent to your Lordship that we deprecate in the strongest manner the imposition of any new direct tax or excise in order to abolish the import duty on cotton manufactures. No measure is, in our opinion, more certain to create irritation, if not serious discontent, in India than the introduction of such new taxes in order to remove that duty."

The question of the removal of the duty was now reserved for future consideration, as the Secretary of State had expressed his concurrence with the Government of India in the opinion that the condition of the finances precluded the possibility of making any remissions of taxation; and with regard to the imposition of new taxes the noble Marquess wrote on the 31st of May—

> "Highly as Her Majesty's Government estimate the importance of this measure, they did not contemplate the attainment of it by new taxation; and I concur with your Government in thinking that such a measure would be inexpedient."

He (the Earl of Northbrook) was satisfied that this statement would be received in India with the greatest satisfaction. As the removal of the duty on cotton manufactures was now owing to the condition of the finances of India, to use the words of the noble Marquess, "not a subject of immediate interest," he would only assure their Lordships that there was no desire whatever on the part of those who had now for many years administered Her Majesty's Indian Empire to protect any branch of industry by Customs duties. All that the Government had had to do from time to time was so to administer the finances and so to adjust taxation as to enable the monies necessary to carry on the Government to be raised in the least objectionable manner, and with due regard to the interests and feelings, and he might say, also, to the prejudices in some respects, of the Natives of that country. With regard, then, to the first subject discussed in the Correspondence, he had only to express his satisfaction with the substance of the reply of the noble Marquess to the despatch of the Government of India, and to say that he thought the noble Marquess had exercised a wise discretion in not pressing the removal of the Customs duty upon cotton manufactures on the Government of India, and in declaring decisively that it was not his intention to instruct the Government of India to consider the imposition of new taxes for the purpose. As to the second subject dealt with in the Correspondence — namely, the manner in which the business relating to legislation should be transacted between the Government of India and the Secretary of State—he would frankly explain to their Lordships that on the receipt of the instructions contained in the noble Marquess's despatch of March, 1874, by the Government of India, they felt apprehension that greater interference by the Secretary of State in matters of detail was contemplated than had heretofore been the case. Those apprehensions were, to a considerable extent, removed by the correspondence which subsequently ensued, but they were renewed by the receipt of the despatch from the Secretary of State of the 11th November, 1875. The Government of India interpreted that despatch as showing that the Secretary of State was not satisfied with the practice which had heretofore prevailed, and that he had an inclination and disposition to interfere more in detail with legislative measures, and especially those relating to finance, than had heretofore been the practice. They therefore thought it their duty to express their views upon the subject. Nothing could be further from his mind, and nothing could be further from the minds of the Members of his Council in India than the idea of setting up for the Government of India any species of independence from Her Majesty's Government. The Government of India were bound to obey the orders of Her Majesty's Government. All the Government of India had ever maintained was that it was wise, politic, in accordance with precedent; and with the spirit of the Government of India Act of 1858, that all ordinary transactions of business should be left to the Government of India, and it would be prejudicial to the interests of India and even to that proper control which should be exercised by the Secretary of State on behalf of the Crown over Indian legislation if he should constantly interpose his authority previous to the action of the Legislative Council of India in respect to, and during the progress of, the Bills which were proposed in India. The Government of India, in their despatch of the 25th of February last, wrote thus—

> "The practice has hitherto been invariably observed of holding the Government of India to be primarily responsible for the finances of India, with full discretion, subject to disallowance if disapproved, to pass such financial measures as may be necessary from time to time. We apprehend that a change in this practice would be attended by a division of this responsibility in respect to the administration of the finances, by delay, and by other serious inconveniences; and we submit that the rules should be so interpreted as to exempt measures affecting finance and customs which have hitherto been dealt with on the responsibility of the Government of India from the rule that requires legislative measures to be referred to the Secretary of State before they are introduced, and that it may be understood that the present practice of leaving in all ordinary cases the initiation of other legislative measures to the Government of India will not be disturbed."

He was glad to find that there was no really serious difference between the views of the noble Marquess and himself on that subject—at any rate, there was no difference in substance—for the noble Marquess in his despatch of the 31st of May stated that in requesting the Government of India to communicate to him full information with respect to financial and other measures, Her Majesty's Government did not intend to imply any want of confidence in the Government of India, or "to withdraw from them the initiative, which, as a general rule, had been left to them." Of course the supreme power must always rest with Her Majesty's Government as representing the Crown, and Her Majesty's Advisers must say how their power should be exercised, but the acceptance of that principle in no way injured his contention that in ordinary cases great latitude should be allowed in matters of detail, that the initiative ought generally to be left to the Indian Government, and that only in matters of the first importance ought the Secretary of State to interfere. He believed, therefore, that in respect of this most important subject there was in substance no serious divergence of views between the Government of India and the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State was entitled to have full information on every matter brought under the consideration of the Government of India, and that information, he was satisfied, had always been supplied. If there had been any omission in that respect, it was a mere matter of accident in the transaction of business. He could answer for it that there had never been the slightest desire on the part of the Indian Government to withhold information from the Secretary of State. There was one more subject—certainly one of the greatest importance—raised in these despatches. It appeared from that despatch from the Secretary of State of the 11th of November, 1875, that in future every legislative measure, however urgently required it might be, was to be communicated by telegraph to the Secretary of State, and sufficient time allowed him to consider whether it should be proceeded with or not. To that arrangement the Government of India entertained the strongest objection. They pointed out that the instructions they had received, if they were to have any practical effect, meant that the Secretary of State was not satisfied to rely upon the opinion of the Governor General in Council on the question whether a measure could or could not be delayed "without serious public evil," but desired to form his own opinion for the guidance of the Government of India. In such circumstances legislation must be intimately connected with the prompt executive action of the Government. A question of urgency was one which of all questions required most imperatively that it should be decided at once and by those on the spot. Yet this rule would take the responsibility of deciding out of the hands of the Government of India and place it in those of the Secretary of State. The questions whether action was or was not urgently required, and what form it should take, would have to be discussed and determined through the medium of telegraph messages, in which the views on either side must necessarily be imperfectly expressed; delay, which from the nature of the case implied embarrassment, if not danger, must occur; and the conduct of business, which might be of the greatest gravity, would be subjected to the risk of misunderstandings which were inseparable from such a mode of proceeding.

> "It is our duty," we added, "to represent to Her Majesty's Government that the withdrawal from the Governor General in Council of the power of prompt action on the most important occasions that can arise will, in our opinion, seriously weaken the authority and hamper the action of the executive Government in India."

For himself, he might say he could conceive of no more unsatisfactory manner of settling important business than by telegraph. He had on more than one occasion seen difficulties arise, owing to the curtness of the language necessarily used in telegraphic despatches, which difficulties he was satisfied would have been altogether avoided, or, at all events, would have been very speedily solved, if the parties had been face to face. On this point he was happy to say the Secretary of State had given an entirely satisfactory explanation. The noble Marquess stated, in his despatch of the 31st of May, that he did not mean to withdraw the power of action from the Governor General; that he fully admitted that "in cases really urgent the delay involved in obtaining the sanction of a superior authority might be most dangerous;" and that the words of his despatch were intended to leave "the Governor General as free as he has ever been at any former time to act, and to act at once in any way which a public emergency may seem to him to demand," provided only he informed the Secretary of State of his proceedings. Of course, as he had already observed, it was necessary and right that the Secretary of State should be informed of what was done in India, and he was perfectly satisfied with the condition in which this matter had been left by the Correspondence. There was nothing in the Correspondence with which he need trouble their Lordships further. He had studiously refrained from entering into any matter of controversy. If he had referred to the issues raised in the despatches, it had been for the purpose of showing that the principles which the Government of India deemed to be of the highest importance had, as he conceived, in substance been recognized by the noble Marquess in his replies, and he believed that any misunderstanding which had existed on the subject had mainly been caused by the difficulty of communicating fully on a matter that was exceedingly complicated in the midst of arduous business of different kinds, and that if he had had the advantage of the free and frank communications with the noble Marquess which were not withheld from him on his return to England, it would have averted the appearance of any serious divergence of opinion between the Government of India and the Home Government. All through the Correspondence the Government of India had asked for no new liberty of action, but wished to adhere to the old lines upon which the business of the Indian Empire had heretofore been transacted. If the noble Marquess agreed with the interpretation which he put on that Correspondence—that, although he thought for certain reasons it was desirable to obtain more information, there was no desire on the part of Her Majesty's Government to change the principles on which the Government of India had been conducted—then, whatever divergence of opinion there might have been at the time, the result would be, so far from any interference with the good government of India, that the relations between Her Majesty's Government, as represented by the Secretary of State, and the Government of India would be strengthened and consolidated. He was obliged to their Lordships for listening so long to him on a matter somewhat difficult to explain, and it had been a great gratification to him to be able to express his satisfaction at the general substance of the views expressed in the last despatches of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I think it is very satisfactory that we should have heard from my noble Friend opposite (the Earl of Northbrook) so clear and ample a statement of his views on this important matter, because it would be a great misfortune if questions of this magnitude in relation to the government by this country of her most important dependency were regarded either as Party questions or as matters principally concerning the individual reputation of particular statesmen. These matters are really of great importance, and I think my noble Friend has done a public service in giving the weight of his authority to doctrines which he conceives to be right doctrines, and to which, as I understood his statement of them, I entirely accede. In the first place, the most important misunderstanding in this Correspondence is that to which my noble Friend has alluded last—namely, with respect to telegraphic communication. I do not think that either he or the Government of India have stated in too strong language the danger that would result if in important emergencies, when delay is a serious evil, they were forced to consult with any distant authority before taking such measures, either executive or legislative, as those emergencies might seem to demand. To every officer, high or low, in India, the discretion must be delegated in moments of urgency of doing what is needed by the public interest, and that discretion must *à fortiori* be conceded to the highest officer of all—the Governor General. I do not think the terms of my original despatch contained in them any instruction of so pernicious a character as was understood to be conveyed in them by the Government of India; but as the same apprehension was felt by noble Lords who had previously been Secretaries of State, and was expressed with some vehemence in the earlier part of the Session, I am bound to assume that my despatches were wanting in that quality which my noble Friend tells us is characteristic of Indian Papers—that is to say, they were not sufficiently voluminous; and that if I had explained things at greater length considerable controversy would have been avoided. It was the same with respect to the Indian Tariff. I thought that I had in my despatch stated with sufficient distinctness that the Customs reform which we desired to establish, and to which we attached very great importance, would have to be accomplished out of such margin as the surplus revenue might yield, and was not by any means intended to involve any increase of taxation. That that was my view long before any of these discussions arose, I may prove by mentioning that I stated it with great emphasis—as I felt myself bound to do—to a deputation of Manchester merchants, and I agree with my noble Friend that the difficulties incident to such a measure in India are so great, and they are accompanied, especially in the case of income tax, with such disadvantages connected with the necessity of employing Native agency, that it is only in a very serious emergency that we should wish to suggest or to authorize any new taxation of that kind. I think the apprehensions of the Government of India were not based on anything to be found in my despatch. But I am inclined to think they agree with the view of the interpretation of my despatch which seems to me the natural one, for they say that they themselves inferred from it on the whole that we did not intend to increase taxation. It is true that the policy which we then invited the Government of India to pursue in that way has for the moment become impossible. In November of last year the exchange on silver was 1*s.* 9½*d.* It has fallen to something like 1*s.* 6½*d.*, although I think matters have a little mended lately. That fall involves a loss to the Government of India in the mere bringing home of the money which the Home Government spends of a sum of not less than £2,000,000 a-year. It is needless to say that that loss makes the giving up (out of a surplus) of the

£800,000 involved in the change which we indicated a much more difficult matter than it was while that £2,000,000 a-year were looked upon as safe in the Exchequer. We do not, however, attach less importance than we formerly did to the remission of this duty. We believe it will be of great benefit to the consumers in India, and to those industries to which the protective character of the duty offers a delusive and injurious shelter, and that it will also stimulate that commercial prosperity upon which so much not only of the welfare of the inhabitants, but of the future strength of the Indian revenue must be held to depend. We, therefore, do not, as I have said, attach less importance than we formerly did to the remission of this tax; but we feel strongly that the finances of India are in a critical condition, and that until the present sources of danger are removed or seriously mitigated it would not be safe to consider any extensive remission of taxation. But these are matters of comparatively small moment if you consider them by the side of the large Constitutional question of the relations of the Government of England to the Government of India round which a great portion of the controversy turns. And in that respect, too, I think our intentions were misunderstood by the Government of India, and, to a great extent, by noble Lords opposite in an earlier part of the Session. The position of the Government of India towards the Government of England appears to be exceedingly plain. It is impossible to recognize in the Government of India the slightest claim to independence. Nay, more, you cannot recognize in them that sort of qualified independence which we concede to the responsible Governments and the elected Parliaments of Canada and Australia. If any such concession were to be made, it would be necessary to give to the Government of India a perfectly new structure, which would be wholly unsuited to the present circumstances of the country, and which the necessities of our position in India would absolutely preclude. Therefore, the supremacy of the Home Government must be maintained intact, in language perfectly unqualified, as far as any question of right or claim is concerned. But the matter is different when you come to questions of prudence and of policy. It is then quite clear that, as to matters of detail, the affairs of a distant and an alien nation, which cannot be studied by those who are not familiar with the circumstances and the peculiarities of the country, cannot be conducted by orders from a distance. Questions involving great principles should be dealt with by the Home Government, but it is impossible that they can safely undertake to manage matters of detail. In all matters of detail a discretion must, to a very large extent, be left to those on the spot, and as a rule the initiative in all questions of government — that is to say, the duty of making the first proposals on which the Home Government are afterwards to judge is wisely left to them also. Her Majesty's Government have never for a moment suggested that any change in these traditional principles should be made; but what they have required is that they should be informed of those measures, in order that they might be the judges whether the questions raised involved matters of principle or only matters of detail, and whether they were or were not of such a character as required the interference of the Home Government. It was on this ground that Her Majesty's Government required that information, not only upon all executive, but also upon all legislative proposals should be submitted to them before they were carried into effect. We required that that should be done, not for the purpose of constant and petty interferences, not for the purpose of taking the Government of India out of the hands of those to whom it has been committed, and who are upon the spot, but for the purpose of enabling us to judge whether or not we ought to interpose. And the cause of the misunderstanding that arose was this—it was thought that because we desired to have the means of knowing whether we ought to interfere, it was our intention constantly to interfere. We, however, entertained no intention of the kind, our only object being that we at home should be enlightened by a full knowledge of the circumstances of each case and of the designs which the Government of India entertained. It must be remembered that a fuller knowledge of this kind has become necessary as the communications between England and India become more rapid. The telegraph wire does not exist for us alone. Constant communications of what is passing in India reach others than those who sit in the India Office. There are frequent attempts to obtain the suspension or the reversal of acts done out in India, and it is a very frequent practice to endeavour to apply to the Home Government political pressure in order to put a stop to proceedings to which parties in India may object. It is impossible that Her Majesty's Government can deal properly with such suggestions and proposals or can exercise duly their duty at once of supervising and of supporting the Government of India unless they are furnished with full information upon all subjects upon which that Government is engaged: and therefore the increase in the rapidity and the ease of communication between this country and India, makes it all the more necessary that the information which we sought should be given to us. The Government of India, in a recent despatch, requested especially that matters concerning financial questions should be excepted from these orders. In reply to that request I have to say that as far as we are personally concerned, we should be very glad to make the exception asked for, because the subject is one which we naturally have not any particular desire to deal with. We have, however, to consider the fact that the British Parliament takes a very great interest in Indian finances, for which we are responsible; that we have to answer Questions, to meet Motions, to refute erroneous views, and to give the information which may be required with regard to those matters, and that, therefore, it is impossible to except the domain of finance especially from the list of subjects upon which we require information. In conclusion, I would say, that in order to explain my view of the relations that exist between the English and Indian Governments, those relations are not unlike those that are maintained between the Home Government and a General commanding in the field. In the latter case any constant interference in the details of movement would be accompanied by those failures which history has associated with the name of the Aulic Council. But, on the other hand, it must be for the Government at home to determine all great questions of policy; they must say what is to be the object of the campaign, and when it shall begin and finish, and the end that it is desired to obtain. And in order that the Home Government may exercise their judgment in these points, it is necessary that they should have the fullest information given to them. That is precisely the position between the Government of India and the Government at home. I do not believe that when once those relations are fully understood any difficulty will be found in working under them. There may be feelings on both sides which it may be necessary to repress, but as long as there is full confidence between the two Governments their respective functions can be kept distinct and their respective duties can be reconciled. I am far from deprecating any such Parliamentary criticism as has been offered upon the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in this matter. On the contrary, the discretion committed to the Government of England with regard to India is so great that it is requisite they should be watched and followed by Parliamentary criticism; and the more these questions are discussed, the more clearly and plainly will come out the sound principles upon which the double Government of India is carried on. It was because I felt that these matters were the subject of some doubt and controversy, and that mistaken ideas prevailed with regard to the important functions of the Government of India, that I laid the Papers on the Table of the House, in order that the attention of Parliament should be invited to the question. It is, therefore, a source of great satisfaction to me that my noble Friend opposite, who of all men has had the best opportunity of judging of these questions, has arrived at conclusions which do not in any material or substantial sense differ from those embodied in the despatches, and that he agrees with me in thinking that whatever acerbity may have characterized some parts of the controversy that arose, the settlement of a common ground of principle is well worth the risk of giving rise to such incidents of controversy. I shall have no objection in laying the additional Papers required on the Table of the House.

LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA: After what has been said by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India, and the noble Earl (the Earl of Northbrook), who have spoken on this question, I have but a few words to add. It is very satisfactory that the Correspondence which is the subject of this discussion has now been laid before your Lordships. In a country so vast and important as India, in which great events take place almost without a moment's warning, it is of the utmost consequence that the authority of the Governor General in Council should not be impaired; at the same time, no one is more sensible than I am of the necessity of the general control of the Secretary of State and the Home Government, especially as an authority to which appeal may be made in case of differences of opinion within the Council of the Governor General. The Secretary of State should, doubtless, be supplied with the fullest information, and it is due to the noble Earl who has recently relinquished the Government of India (the Earl of Northbrook), to say that all the demi-official correspondence of which I had any cognizance showed the greatest desire to give full information, and to avoid, if possible, any collision of opinion. But if the Governor General is hampered and trammeled by too many leading-strings, it is impossible that he can have confidence to act with the necessary decision and promptitude in the emergencies which are constantly liable to arise. I have, therefore, heard with much pleasure the assurance of the noble Marquess that it is not his intention to depart materially from the manner in which business has heretofore been conducted between the Secretary of State and the Government of India. This assurance will be received in India with the greatest satisfaction.

Motion *agreed to.*

Then, an Address for Copy of reply to despatch from the Government of India, 72 Public, 24th December, 1874, being moved by the Marquess of SALISBURY, the same was *agreed to.*

EDUCATION—SCHOOLS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD ABERDARE asked the Lord President of the Council, Whether he has the means of making a Return to this House of the number of Schools in England and Wales in which instruction is given to children above thirteen years of age; and, if he has not such means, whether he will take any measure to supply such deficiency? The noble Lord said, there had been exhaustive inquiry into the Universities, public schools, and elementary schools, followed by legislative action, but there had been no inquiry into the state of the schools—except the endowed schools throughout the country—which occupied a position between the elementary and higher class schools, and he believed that on inquiry it would be found that large districts were insufficiently supplied with the means of obtaining such education. He knew it would be impossible for the noble Duke, however well disposed, to furnish the same amount of information on this subject which would be supplied through the medium of a Royal Commission. At the same time, valuable information might be obtained through the large body of Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors who were employed by the Department, and the country might in this way get to know the number of these schools, the number of children attending them, and the class of education given there.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that if the noble Lord confined his Question to the number of elementary schools under inspection, there would be no difficulty in furnishing the information. Indeed, he could give it at once. The number of elementary schools under inspection was 15,921, and there were in them 92,251 children who were above 13 years of age, making 3·36 per cent of the scholars on the register of the aided schools. If, however, the reference was not merely to schools under inspection, but to schools of all classes, he had not the means of obtaining the information sought for, and doubted whether the expenditure of time, labour, and money necessary to procure such information would justify the Government in attempting to procure it. If, too, an inquiry were instituted, it was doubtful whether the Return would be even approximately accurate, for the Inspectors were not likely to be able to obtain these particulars. Even now it was difficult to get the work done in the Department, for this work increased day by day with the increase in the number of elementary schools and of the scholars attending there; and the work was likely to become greater if the

Bill now before the other House were passed. Moreover, the information asked for would be necessarily imperfect, because there must be a number of schools into the condition of which no one would have a right to inquire, and as to which the persons conducting them might be unwilling to give information. Under all the circumstances, he must answer the second part of the noble Lord's Question in the negative.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 4*th August*, 1876.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee—Resolutions* [August 1] *reported.*

Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Sheriff Courts (Scotland) [96]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [281]; Queen Anne's Bounty * [278].

Committee—Report—Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bilbrough, &c.) * [265]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Birmingham, &c.) * [266]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bath, &c) * [264]; Prisons * [180-284].

Considered as amended—Elementary Education [277]; Forfeiture Relief * [259].

Third Reading—Pollution of Rivers [276], and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—UNION WORKHOUSES.—QUESTION.

Mr. MACARTNEY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether considering the great disproportion which prevails between the number of union workhouses at present existing in Ireland and the number of paupers requiring relief therein, Her Majesty's Government have it in contemplation to promote, through the Local Government Board in that Country, the amalgamation of Poor Law Unions, so as to reduce the number of workhouses and the consequent unnecessarily high poor rates now levied upon property in Ireland?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, the number of paupers now receiving relief in Irish workhouses is in many cases much below the accommodation provided, and it is possible that a considerable diminution in the expenditure for establishment charges might be effected by the amalgamation of some Poor Law Unions, and a consequent reduction in the number of workhouses. But the average area of Irish Unions is already much larger than that of the English Unions, and in considering any proposal for their amalgamation it would be very necessary to bear in mind not only the economical side of the question, but also the retention of proper facilities for the administration of relief to the sick and destitute poor, and for securing the attendance of Guardians at the meetings of the Boards. The Government do not contemplate the formation of a general scheme for amalgamation of Unions, but the Local Government Board will be prepared to consider on its merits any proposal for the amalgamation of neighbouring Unions which may be brought before them by the Guardians of such Unions.

Mr. MACARTNEY gave Notice that he would early next Session move for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the subject.

METROPOLIS—HYDE PARK — ROTTEN ROW.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. REPTON asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If any steps will be taken to improve Rotten Row during the autumn, as the ride is in a worse state than it has been for some years?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, in answer to the Question of my hon. Friend, I have to state that the officers of the Board of Works have ascertained that the Row is in a very unsatisfactory state. The materials which have been used for the road are rotten and altogether unsuitable. It has been agreed that the road should be put into a perfectly sound and proper state during the autumn.

Mr. MELLOR asked out of what funds the cost of the repairs would come?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that the cost would be paid out of the Vote for the Park.

RAILWAYS—ACCIDENT ON THE GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY AT BOURTON. QUESTION.

Mr. GOLDNEY asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether his at-ention has been called to another accident which has occurred on the Bristol and Exeter Railway, near the spot where the accident happened to the Flying Dutchman on the 27th of July last; and, whether he has taken any further steps in the matter?

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY: My attention, Sir, has been called to the accident in question. It happened to a goods train, and no one was seriously injured, but it is important as happening so near the same place. The Company have not yet sent to the Board of Trade the particulars of this second accident. Captain Tyler has, however, been at once directed to examine the whole of the permanent way between Bristol and Exeter, now belonging to the Great Western Railway Company.

HERTSLET'S MAP OF EUROPE BY TREATY—NON-EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—QUESTION.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Foreign Office is prepared to submit to the Treasury the expediency of holding out to Mr. Hertslet some inducement to prepare a work on Treaties respecting Non-European Countries, on the same plan as his recent work, entitled "The Map of Europe by Treaty?"

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, I am sure my hon. Friend asks this Question with the kindest intention towards Mr. Hertslet. The Question raises many delicate considerations with which the Treasury may or may not be concerned. I am not surprised, Sir, that my hon. Friend should think that it is desirable to extend the scope of Mr. Hertslet's *Map of Europe by Treaty*. There are Treaties with China and other Asiatic countries. There are, again, other Treaties between European countries and the semi-civilized States of Africa which often give rise to complicated questions. The same may be said for North and South America. Her Majesty's Government will be glad to see the principle of Mr. Hertslet's last work extended; but I am sure my hon. Friend will see that his Question is one upon which it is not desirable that I should make any statement at present.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

[Bill 277.]

(*Viscount Sandon, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

FURTHER CONSIDERATION.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [3rd August] proposed (on Consideration of the Bill, as amended) to the proposed Amendment in page 6, line 17, after the word "pay," to insert the words

"If the parent of any child who is resident in the district of a School Board is unable, by reason of poverty, to pay the fees of such child at a public elementary school, or any part of such fee, and if the School Board fails to make regulations, under Clauses twenty-five and seventy-four of the Elementary Education Act of 1870, for the payment of the same, it shall be the duty of the guardians, if satisfied of such inability, to pay the same in accordance with the provisions of this section,"—(*Lord Robert Montagu,*)—

And which Amendment to the proposed Amendment was, to leave out the words "who is," in line 1, in order to insert the words "not being,"—(*Sir W. Vernon Harcourt,*)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words 'who is' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Viscount SANDON said, he wished to communicate to the House the result of the consideration which the Government had given to the question raised by the proposition of the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath (Lord Robert Montagu)—namely, to make it the duty of Boards of Guardians everywhere—even in school board districts—to pay the school fees for the children of parents whom they considered to be incapable of paying them—since the late protracted and somewhat heated opposition to which they were subjected last night. He thought every hon. Member must feel that there had been considerable misapprehension on this subject, and it might be well that he should recall to their recollection what was the state of the law at the present moment as to the remission and payment of fees. The state of the law was this—In Scotland, according to the Act of 1872, passed by the late Liberal Government, the school boards had nothing whatever to do with either the remission or payment of fees for poor children; but it was laid down in Section 69 that—

> "it shall be the duty of the said Parochial Board to pay out of the poor relief fund any reasonable charge for the education of any child whose parent is unable to pay the school fees."

By Clause 14 of the present Bill, which had nearly passed through the various Forms of the House, and to which the House had given its assent, it was provided that the parent of any child not being resident in the district of a school board—

> "who is unable by reason of poverty to pay the ordinary fee for such child at a public elementary school, or any part of such fee, may apply to the guardians having jurisdiction in the parish in which he resides, and it shall be the duty of such guardians, if satisfied of such inability, to pay the said fee, not exceeding threepence a week."

So that for Scotland, and all towns in England not under school boards, there was one uniform law—that on account of the compulsion upon parents to send their children to school if they had not sufficient means to pay the school fees, and yet were not out-door paupers—payment for their children out of the rates by the Guardians having been already provided for by the Bill of 1873 of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford—it was the duty of the Guardians to pay a moderate school-fee. What, then, was the state of the law in regard to districts where there were school boards? In all school board districts the school board had the power of either remitting the fees in their own schools or of paying them in schools which did not belong to them. Now, with regard to the action of the Education Department, the position taken up was this. The matter was raised as early as 1871 on the Wednesbury School Board case. The Wednesbury School Board wrote to ask the assent of the Education Department to their 6th bye-law, which provided that they might remit the fees of poor children in their own board schools. They did not, however, provide that they would also pay the fees in any schools which did not belong to them. On the 6th of December, 1871, the Department of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford was then Vice President, addressed a letter to the Wednesbury School Board on the subject of these bye-laws, in which the following remarks were made by the direction of the right hon. Gentleman:—

> "With respect to Bye-law 6, in which provision is made for the remission of school fees at board schools in cases of poverty, but not for payment of fees at other schools under similar circumstances, my Lords are prepared to allow it. I am, however, directed to point out to you, that in the opinion of my Lords it would not be just to deprive a parent of his right to choose the particular public elementary school to which he will send his child because, while he is compelled by these bye-laws to send his child to school, he is unable from poverty to pay his school fee; but my Lords cannot doubt that the school board will see the justice of making use of the power they possess under Section 25 in favour of any such parent."

That was the final delivery of the last Government, and the course laid down seemed to him to be a wise course to pursue. Upon this precedent the Department, under both the last and the present Government, had always acted, and had never committed themselves to acknowledging that it was right in a school only to remit fees in their own schools, and not to pay them in others which the poor parent might prefer. The Department, however, in this, as in all other cases, refuted to give an interpretation of an Act, as their interpretation could, of course, have no binding effect. He was informed that it was not quite clear whether the course pursued by the Wednesbury School Board was legal or not, but the view taken by the Education Department of the then Government was that it was contrary to the spirit of the Act that they should only undertake to remit fees and should not at the same time say they would pay them, the position being that it was fully understood that the Act of 1870 was passed distinctly on the basis of the recognition as far as possible of the parental right to the choice of the school for his child. This was obliged to be given up in certain cases where there was only one school, but the Act of 1870 was based on the principle, over and over again stated in the discussions in the House by the Ministers responsible for that measure, that, where there were two, the parent was to have the right of choice. The House would see the justice of this, and it would also feel that in cases of extreme poverty it was bound to be just as careful of parental feeling as it was in the cases of more well-to-do persons. The state of the case was this—We respected the feelings of parents generally, but, owing to the action of certain school boards, if parents became very poor we subjected them to the injustice of saying —"We will oblige your children to go to school, but we will not give you the choice of a school." The acknowledgment made by the Educational Department of the then Government was a very valuable and important one, but they did not feel sufficiently clear of their legal position to refuse to pass these bye-laws; and from that time all bye-laws which contained merely a provision for the remission of fees, without any provision for the payment of fees, had been sanctioned under this protest by the Department. A correspondence ensued with the Wednesbury Board, who said they could not accept the suggestion of the Department; and the closing letter of the Department contained this paragraph—

> "No addition to such bye-law was suggested, though my Lords thought it right to call the attention of your board to the power given them, independently of any bye-law, by Section 25 of the Elementary Education Act, by which power they will be relieved from the necessity of enforcing penalties against a parent who, though unable from poverty to pay a school fee, prefers that his child attend a public elementary day school selected by himself."

The Department thought strongly it would be a serious thing to enforce penalties against parents if you did not give them a choice of schools; that was the state of the case now, and it remained uncertain whether a magistrate would agree to convict a poor parent who could not afford to pay the fees at the school he preferred, and who refused, on conscientious grounds—as might likely be the case *e.g.* among Roman Catholics—to send his child to a secular board school where his fees would be remitted. It was a subject of considerable importance and for cool argument, and certainly the Committee would now see not of a Party character nor one of those matters which, when understood, should create excitement, or of those matters that should provoke a heated discussion of such a nature as that of last evening. He said last night, when the question was first raised, that, as his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford did not seem prepared to support it—which, of course, implied that hon. Gentlemen opposite also would not do so—and as it was so late in the Session, and everybody was so anxious to close the consideration of the Bill, that he thought it better not to accept the proposal of the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath (Lord Robert Montagu), saying at the same time it was impossible not to admit it was an important one. In fact, he should have been eating the words of the Department if he had not acknowledged that. [Mr. Lowe: A blot was hit.] Yes, he said it hit a blot in the Bill, and in the Education Act of 1870. It must, however, be remembered that when identically the same proposal had been made by his hon. Friend the Member for North-East Lancashire on Clause 14 in Committee on the Bill, he had then asked his hon. Friend not to open that important question on the ground of time not allowing fresh matter to be added to the discussions on the Bill, which, even then, had been much protracted so as to endanger its progress; and as no interest was then shown by the House in the matter, the Amendment was withdrawn, on the very same grounds on which he asked the noble Lord yesterday not to press his. After he had used these words an unexpected amount of feeling was shown by hon. Members of experience on both sides of the House, which it was exceedingly difficult to answer by argument. Hon. Members representing Irish constituencies said they felt the grievance to be a very strong one in large towns in England with a considerable Irish population; and there was not a shadow of doubt that the class particularly injured was the poor in the large towns, which included a large proportion of Roman Catholics, to whom it was a serious grievance to be forced indirectly in this way to send their children to board schools, contrary, as he and the Department had always, under both Governments, held, to the principle of the Act of 1870. We must look at things as they really were, and, whether it was before an Orange meeting or any other meeting, he should be prepared to defend the position they had taken up with the most perfect confidence. The people of the country had the strongest sense of justice in these matters; and when a real and genuine case of injustice was made out, one which was not intended by the Act of 1870, as was admitted by the last Government, and the existence of which was hardly known until it was urged strongly by hon. Members from Ireland, it was certain they would not allow it to remain. Of course, the position was one of some little difficulty, and they were exceedingly loth to raise unnecessarily questions which would trench on the conscientious feelings of any hon. Gentleman opposite; but he thought on consideration the Nonconformists would see that the proposal did not in any way touch their conscientious scruples, but simply did away with an injury now done to the consciences of poor people. He was sure they would bear him out when he said he had avoided as much as possible things which would be distasteful and disagreeable to them; but this question being raised, it seemed necessary to find some mode of meeting it. The Amendment of the noble Lord was, no doubt, open to considerable objection on the ground that it did seem to throw a sort of slur on school boards, which was, he was sure, not intended; it might, however, be held to imply that school boards largely were neglecting their duties in this matter. The Government had considered the subject with very great care. They were aware that some hon. Members naturally wished to take a division on the principle involved; and after calm consideration, and after the more friendly tone in which the discussion closed that morning, the Government were inclined to recommend a course which he hoped would meet with considerable assent. If the noble Lord would withdraw his clause, they would propose to take the sense of the House by an Amendment of Clause 14. That clause now only provided that the parent of any child, "not being resident in the district of a school board," who was unable from poverty to pay the fee, might apply to the Guardians, who should pay it, if satisfied of his inability to do so; they would propose to omit the words "not being resident in the district of a school board." That would make the clause applicable to the whole country, and so far as the relief of the poor for the purposes of education was concerned, school-board districts would be placed in exactly the same position as the rest of England and of Scotland. They would thus have one uniform law for the whole of England and Scotland; and where the Guardians were satisfied that the parent was too poor to pay the fees of his child, they would be obliged to pay the necessary fees, and the parent would have the choice of sending his child to any public elementary school. This proposal prevented the idea of any slur on school boards; it raised the question plainly and simply; and he hoped and believed the House would now approach it in a calm and considerate spirit. When hon. Members remembered that the strong appeal which was addressed to the House on the subject by hon. Members from Ireland on behalf of their co-religionists was caused by the action of certain school boards, they would feel that the subject was a grave one, and that the Government were not acting rashly or wrongly in asking them calmly to consider and pass a dispassionate judgment upon it, now that the question had been brought before them.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, his position was different from that of most of his Friends, and he wished it to be understood that what he desired to say he spoke without communication with them.

Mr. SPEAKER called the right hon. Gentleman to Order, as he had already spoken on the Amendment before the House—that of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he was ready, if it would facilitate discussion, to withdraw his Amendment.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU believed that the proposal now made by the Government would effect the object which he and his Friends sitting on that (the Opposition) side of the House had in view, and if there was an understanding that upon the withdrawal of his Amendment the House would proceed to a division upon the omission of the words "not being resident in the district of a school board," he should be happy to withdraw his Amendment. He trusted, however, that some assurance would be given by hon. Gentlemen on the front Opposition Bench that they would not throw any obstruction in the way, because otherwise the withdrawal of his Amendment would place him in an unfavourable position.

Mr. FAWCETT pointed out that the 25th clause of the Act of 1870 gave a permissive power to school boards, while the present Amendment was obligatory. The result would be that there would be permissive clause in operation in one Act as to school boards, while in another Boards of Guardians would be compelled to pay these rates. Did not the noble Lord the Vice President think that, under these circumstances, it would be a necessary part of his proposal to repeal the 25th clause of the Act of 1870?

THE O'DONOGHUE recommended the withdrawal of the Amendment, and that the matter should be left in the hands of the Government, in which, in this respect, he had perfect confidence.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the point raised by the hon. Member for Hackney was no doubt important, but he would suggest that it would be more conveniently discussed after the withdrawal of the Amendment, and when the proposal of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council was before the House. They were not asked to agree to the proposal, but simply to allow the withdrawal of the Amendments on the Paper, so as to be in a condition to consider and deal with it.

MR. RAMSAY said, that the Amendment of the Government would leave the law exactly the same as it now existed in Scotland, and he approved of it on that account.

MR. HOPWOOD asked whether the effect of the Amendment and the Government proposal would not be exactly the same, except that the latter would avoid naming the school board in a derogatory manner?

MR. NEWDEGATE wished to ask who would be the judge of justice in this case? The noble Lord defended his Amendment on the ground of justice; but if no discretion was left either to the school boards or the Guardians he should like to know who was to decide what was justice?

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, and proposed Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. W. E. FORSTER proposed to insert after the word "parent" the words "not being a pauper." The clause was not meant to apply to paupers, and he thought, therefore, that this Amendment was necessary. With regard to the clause before us, his position in the matter was different from that of several of his hon. Friends. He had always defended the 25th clause, being of opinion that the right should be given to the parent of choosing whatever school he would prefer to send his child to; and he was willing to abide by the exact terms of the letter written in 1871, for which he was responsible, but in which the Marquess of Ripon also agreed. It was to the effect that the Department considered that by the Act of 1870 there was a discretion in school boards, whether they should make a bye-law or not; but that they would be acting in the spirit of the Act of 1870 if they did make a bye-law. He regretted that the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath (Lord Robert Montagu) had mooted the question, and that the Government had last night rather hastily adopted his Amendment, as it must inevitably lead to serious difficulties. He (Mr. W. E. Forster) could not, however, disown or retract his own views. It had been said that the supporters of the 25th clause were bound to push their views to a logical conclusion and to support the Amendment; but it was not always expedient in administrative and Parliamentary matters to push things to their logical conclusion. If, moreover, the Government had intended to carry out the principle to its logical conclusion, they ought to have put the proposal in the original Bill. Again, this proposal did two things; it not only took from the school board the discretion they now possessed; but it subjected the school board to the authority of the Board of Guardians. He repeated that it would have been better to let the matter alone. The 25th clause of the Act of 1870 was now exciting very little feeling or attention throughout the country, and it was unwise to renew the agitation it had excited by the Amendment of the noble Lord. He now, however, came to the suggestion of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council to omit the words "not being resident in the district of a school board," the effect of which would be to make it the duty of Guardians all over the Kingdom to pay the fees of poor children, but, at the same time, to leave to the school boards the option they now possessed, by leaving the 25th clause unrepealed. Well, having always adopted the principle of the 25th clause, he should feel it his duty to vote for the Motion of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council thus putting England in the position now occupied in this respect by Scotland, on condition, however, that if this was done the present clause should be repealed. He could not help saying, although many of his Friends would not agree with him, that the Bill was a progress in education and would tend to promote it throughout the country, and he trusted the Government would not imperil its passing by persevering in their proposal, without accepting the suggestion that the 25th clause should be repealed.

Mr. PELL said, that, much as he regretted all that had occurred last night, he believed that good had come out of it. If his noble Friend's suggestion were adopted, the inquiry as to the position of parents and their ability to pay school fees would be left in the hands of the Guardians, who could, though their officers, carry out that duty much better than the school boards; and if that were agreed to, he could see no objection to the repeal of the 25th clause.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT observed that he was in a different position from that which his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) occupied, as he had never been a consenting party to a great portion of the legislation of 1870. He was always an opponent of the 25th clause, and would gladly see it repealed; but that which was now proposed by the noble Lord opposite would be an aggravation for it would make universal and compulsory the principle of that clause. What had now taken place showed that hon. Members on that side of the House had not acted unjustifiably in asking for some time for discussing the matter. He felt bound to vote against the proposed Amendment of the noble Lord, which was full of the objections which he felt with respect to the 25th clause.

Mr. CALLAN said, that the scenes of last evening had one good result, for they showed that the Irish Members, although deserted by the front Opposition bench, had found Friends at the other side of the House. For his part he, as an Irish Roman Catholic, regarded with suspicion any proposal coming from the front Opposition bench. He remembered a memorable night when the late hon. and learned Solicitor General, with elephantine power, came down to supported the University Bill of the late Government, and his principal argument in its favour was that it was a Bill disapproved of equally by the Protestants and Roman Catholics. Probably his reason for now opposing the Amendment was that it was one in favour of the pauper Roman Catholic children in England. He hoped that in those places where there were many Irish electors the Division Lists upon the question would be carefully examined, and that on educational questions the front Opposition bench would be divided now and for ever from the Roman Catholic Party.

Mr. RICHARD said, he concurred in the remarks of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt). He had himself always objected to the 25th clause, and in 1874 introduced a Bill for the purpose of repealing it, and that measure was supported by the whole of the Liberal Party, except those connected with Ireland. He thought that the remarks of the hon. Member for Dundalk (Mr. Callan) would not contribute to the peaceable discussion of the question, and hoped that no man in that House would be deterred from recording his vote by the kind of threat which he had held out. He (Mr. Richard) deeply regretted that the Government had accepted the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath, as the effect would be to promote discussions in the country full of bitterness and animosities. He concurred in thinking that the Amendment of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council was an aggravated form of the 25th clause, and he should feel bound to give it every resistance.

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out that the Amendment indicated by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil was not before the House. The Amendment before it was that of the right hon. Member for Bradford.

Mr. FAWCETT said it was very desirable that the Government should at once state what their intentions were in reference to the 25th clause.

Viscount SANDON said, the Government had been struck by the very marked feeling of the House with reference to the 25th clause, and thought it their duty to give way to it. If, therefore, his Amendment were accepted, he should ssent to the proposal of the right hon. entleman the Member for Bradford at the 25th clause be repealed.

Mr. CLARE READ said, he sup- orted the proposal of the right hon. entleman the Member for Bradford, ecause its object was that every poor ild should receive religious teaching conformity with the religion of his arents. In a rural Board of Guardians f which he was a member no question xcept that of the poverty of the parents ver arose when the question of edu- ating pauper children arose. The Guar- ians had simply done the best they ould for the education of the children, nd had always sent pauper children the schools which their parents pre- erred.

Mr. GOSCHEN pointed out that the ssent which the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council promised to the proposal of his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford was, in fact, no concession at all. If the Amendment proposed by the noble Lord to be made n the 14th clause was adopted, the 25th clause of the former Act must go as a matter of course. The noble Lord proposed, as a concession, to repeal the 25th clause, which gave optional power to remit or pay fees, and to substitute for it a clause which would render the payment of school fees compulsory upon all Boards of Guardians.

Mr. MELDON thought there would be no necessity to repeal the 25th clause, as, in his view, that provision and the clause in the present Bill would work harmoniously together.

Mr. HOPWOOD was understood to intimate that he did not approve of the Amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY considered it desirable that all impediments to children being taught in conformity with the religion of their parents ought to be removed.

Dr. WARD said, the true Liberals on this question were the Irish Members and some hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted.*

Viscount SANDON moved, as an Amendment, in Clause 14, page 6, lines 10 and 11, the omission of the words, "not being resident in the district of a School Board."

Amendment proposed, in page 6, line 10, to leave out the words "not being resident in the district of a School Board."—(*Viscount Sandon.*)

Mr. RYLANDS said, he wished, in the first instance, to express his deep regret that Her Majesty's Government had re-opened a question which there was reason to hope was in a fair way of being settled by the consent of different opinions. Unfortunately, too, they had raised the question in a manner not creditable to themselves. Without consideration they had adopted an Amendment to a clause calling up the contention of last night, and by their present proposal they had shown the Amendment to be an untenable one. The course that they (the Opposition) took last night was justified by the event, and had shown that they were perfectly right in urging that there should be more consideration of the matter. They now had to consider what course should be taken in relation to the present Amendment of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council. It appeared to him (Mr. Rylands) that they were now practically brought to face a great difficulty. They had dealt with pauperism, and Parliament had met the difficulty by saying—"We will give a free education to the children of pauper parents, and we will recognize the religion of those children's parents, and allow them to choose their school; and in many districts in the country we propose to give facilities for the payment of the fees of the children of indigent parents." That was the course they had taken, and they had now to determine what should be done in the case of the large towns. Were they to say to poor parents—"Unless you pay the money you cannot afford to pay, and unless you send your children to schools to which you cannot afford to send them, you shall be subject to fine or imprisonment?" For his own part, he was not prepared to be a party to the fining or imprisoning of poor people who could not afford to pay for their children's education. If the authority of the law were brought in, they were bound to make provision in that law that a person who was not in a position to pay should not suffer punishment for his poverty, but some means must be provided by which he should be enabled to fulfil the requirements of the law and have his children educated. He (Mr. Rylands) should have been glad if there were no such religious difficulty, and he felt it would have been a great blessing if the religious difficulty had been removed. What position were they now in? Parliament gave pauper children the opportunity of going to the school their parents preferred, and the same opportunity was given to people who were well off; but what was to be done in respect of those persons in that class which was just above pauperism—who were struggling against pauperism? Simply, because they were poor were they to be denied that which was given to paupers and to those who were much better off? Was it to be said to them—"We insist that you shall either send your children to school and pay their school fees out of your miserable resources," or else compel them to send their children to schools which the parents in their own consciences thought they ought not to be sent to? He had always felt as a magistrate that if he had to exercise the compulsory requirements of the Education law—if a parent were willing to send his child to a school of a particular denomination, and it was not open for him to do so—and if he knew that the parent was unable from his poverty to pay, he must say as a magistrate that under those circumstances he would not send a man to prison. He considered that Boards of Guardians were far better judges of who were paupers than a school board could be. It was most unwise in his opinion that school boards should under the 25th clause have that control of the rates. It had a tendency to promote an undue partiality for some particular schools, and there was a temptation to give relief to parents who were not the proper recipients of that relief. Everyone was perfectly well aware that a person would not go to the Board of Guardians unless from sheer necessity, and if he did go an officer would be appointed to investigate the circumstances of the applicant for relief; and he could trust the Board of Guardians so to investigate every application that came before them under this clause, that it would prevent any abuse. When means were provided for giving food to those who were starving, some means should also be found to supply intellectual food. He would not be a party to the mockery of saying to people who were quite unable to pay—we insist on you sending your children to school, and yet take no means of providing the fees they could not pay. He recognized in the Amendment no case of concurrent endowment; to that he had strong objection, as indeed he had to all religious endowment. The religious difficulty was the greatest to contend with in the matter of education, but if the leading endowment of religion by the State, in the form of a Church Establishment, were removed, the difficulties in the way of education would be reduced to a minimum. He regretted that he could not go with some of his Friends, but he was only taking the line he had followed throughout these discussions. The Amendment had been suggested by way of a compromise, and he did not feel called upon to refuse it.

Mr. MELLOR begged to compliment the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) on the change which had come over his sentiments after last night's rest. The hon. Member had gone into the Lobby three times against the proposal submitted yesterday, but he now saw his way to accept it in another form. They on that (the Ministerial) side vindicated last night by their votes the position which hon. Gentlemen opposite now took up, and they expressed their determination to remain to an hour however late, if necessary, to do so. Various attempts at compromise had been made on the previous night, but they had all been frustrated by hon. Gentlemen opposite. Now, however, for political purposes, and in order to retain that position which some of them thought they possessed, they turned round and took the popular view, and began to plead for the pauper and the poor.

Mr. NEWDEGATE considered that the House were about to pass a clause for the benefit of the Roman Catholic poor of large towns. The clause would make the fees to Roman Catholic schools compulsory, and the effect of that would be that the Educational Votes of this country, like the Educational Fund in Ireland, would become largely contributory to monastic and conventual schools. ["Oh, oh!"] They all knew that the influence of the priests over Roman Catholics was such that many of those parents would make themselves poor for the nonce, in order to obtain the favour of their spiritual directors. ["Oh, oh! *and* No!"] What the House was now doing was giving a forced subsidy to those Roman Catholic schools respecting which an Inspector had lately reported that—

> "he lamented to state that the Roman Catholic schools are now mainly under the tuition and direction of monks and nuns."

The proposal, in fact, was neither more nor less than concurrent endowment in a very objectionable form. To his thinking, if the State insisted on compulsion, it ought also to provide the schools. That course had been adopted in Germany and the United States, and it was a consistent course. They were, by what they were doing, launching themselves on a course the results of which he was confident they could not see, and from which hereafter they would find it very difficult to withdraw.

Mr. M'LAREN said, the real question was whether school boards or Boards of Guardians were the most likely to administer the local rates with the greatest economy. That point was discussed in connection with the Scotch Act, and the House had unanimously agreed to give the power now sought to the Boards of Guardians, or, in other words, to the parochial boards in Scotland.

Mr. DODSON said, he would vote against the Amendment. As the matter now stood, where there were school boards they had a discretion as to the payment of fees. Where there was no school board, the Board of Guardians were to pay fees; but they had no discretion in the matter except as to whether the parent of the child was able to pay or not. The school board was the higher educational authority, and they had, therefore, a wider discretion in judging in the matter. He was not in favour of withdrawing the discretion now possessed by the higher authority in order to confer a more limited discretion on the inferior authority, the Board of Guardians. He objected to alter a system which had hitherto worked well unless for the most valid reasons. The alteration now proposed had been sprung upon them suddenly, and he was not prepared to vote for it at a moment's notice.

Mr. A. MILLS pointed out that it was not a question as to a higher or lower authority. Indeed, it was not an educational matter at all. It was a mere question as to the degree of poverty and the ability of the parent to pay school fees, of which the Board of Guardians must be better judges than the school board.

Mr. GOSCHEN remarked that although Guardians might be better judges of the poverty of parents, on the other hand, he submitted that school boards would be the best judges as to the merits of the schools, and their respective worthiness to receive the fees, for they could take those things into their consideration, and that the Guardians had no power to do. It was now proposed that the latter, even in school districts, should, at the option of the parent, pay fees to any school, irrespective altogether of its character, and that was a matter which required to be looked after.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the question of whether the money raised from the rates for the purpose of education should be applied to board schools only, or to such schools as the parents approved, was neither with the school boards nor the Boards of Guardians, but with the High Court of Parliament. It was a question of high policy, which ought to be determined on general grounds by Parliament, and not left to be settled by every school board according to the views of particular localities. Accordingly, if the House were going, as he hoped they were, after passing this Amendment, to accept the proposition to repeal the 25th clause of the Act of 1870, they would be relieving the school boards of what he thought was an embarrassing task imposed upon them, and transferring once for all to Parliament the duty of deciding the general principle on which relief should be given. That being done, the House might safely leave the settlement of individual cases to the Boards of Guardians, who had the best means of forming a judgment upon them.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR agreed that the proposal involved a principle which Parliament ought to settle, and that it was an improvement on the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath (Lord Robert Montagu). Supposing it to be carried, then, as a logical consequence, it would be desirable that the 25th clause of the Act of 1870 should be repealed. At the same time he should consider it his duty to vote against the Amendment for several reasons. It was said the Amendment would establish a uniform system for the whole country. The Guardians in Scotland did pay the fees; but the power in the Scotch Bill was very carefully guarded, whereas in this Bill the parent was told he could apply for parochial relief for the education of his child, and yet not be pauperized or degraded by failing to perform his duty to his child. On a former occasion the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) had wisely said—"There must be no free education except for those who are in receipt of pauper relief." Surely, if a person was not a pauper, he could find a 1*d.* or 2*d.* per week to educate his child. But if he was on such a margin of destitution that he could not do so, then the different religious Bodies who wished his children to be educated would readily find the money for him. This clause, however, would make the giving of this relief compulsory, and very largely extend the principle. He objected to it on the ground that it took the House by surprise. Such an important alteration ought to be most carefully considered by the House. At the very end of the Session, when the country had no expectation of such a proposal, the Government introduced this large change, which he believed would have a most demoralizing and pauperizing influence upon the people in our large towns. Under these circumstances, as on a previous occasion, the hon. Member for Westminster opposed the abolition of the 25th clause at the end of a Session, so he was of opinion that they ought not to decide this question without giving the country time to consider it.

Mr. HAYTER said, he would explain the operation of the present law in a London parish as it had been told him by a Poor Law Guardian. The fees were paid by the relieving officer direct to the school managers, and the names of recipients printed on a list corresponding with the lists of other recipients of relief. If the Amendment of the noble Lord were accepted, this plan would be acted upon throughout the country; and it would pauperize the people thus to bring them into contact with Boards of Guardians for school fees. That was a dangerous principle, and he decidedly objected to it.

Mr. E. JENKINS opposed the Amendment, urging that it continued the policy of hostility to school boards which the Government had already evinced, and that what they were asked to do by the clause was to pay money for parents who selected schools where their children would receive the religious education which they wished them to be instructed in. The clause would have the effect of encouraging Ultramontane doctrines—doctrines subversive of the principles upon which the House rested. He was an advocate of religious freedom, and as such he maintained that the Amendment was consistent with all that the Government had done in aid of denominationalism as against free education, but he hoped the time was not far off when the House would be able to reverse their policy.

Mr. FAWCETT said, the Roman Catholic Members had a perfect right to their own views on education, but he and his Friends had an equal right to theirs. There was, in fact, an inseparable gulf between them, and whatever threats might be thrown out, and whatever the consequences of the next Election might be, he and those who thought with him would be firm, stanch, and consistent in the principles they advocated. The Government, in their new zeal for centralization, were about to impose this duty upon the Guardians without ascertaining whether they thought it desirable, or giving the Guardians the discretion which had been allowed to school boards. He thought their opinion might at least have been consulted before the Amendment was brought forward. The effect of the clause would be to pauperize the country. He had always objected to the 25th clause of the Education Act on social and economical, far more than religious grounds, and he maintained that it was idle to say that a person who could not afford 2*d.* or 3*d.* a-week to educate his child was not a pauper, especially as in the Bill they had declared that it was the duty of parents to educate their children as much as to feed and clothe them. If a man, in consequence of illness or injury from an accident, was unable to work for a few weeks, and obtained medical relief, he was instantaneously declared to be a pauper, and debarred from exercising his rights of citizenship for one year. But by the Bill it was proposed to allow a man to otain relief for the education of his ild, and it was provided that he should t thereby become a pauper. Parliaent ought at least to be consistent, d to adopt the same principle in both ses; and the reason why they did not could only conclude was, that there as some unavowed motive at the back 'it. Hon. Gentleman opposite, owing the course they had taken, had acuired fresh allies in the hon. Member r Dundalk (Mr. Callan) and his riends; but if the hon. Member desired ascertain whether his enthusiastic eling of rejoicing at the new alliance ere reciprocated, let him next Session ove a Resolution to the effect that the enominational system of education hich worked so well in England should e extended to Ireland. In that event, e believed the hon. Member would find ut that those to whom he had allied imself, while they were in favour of enominationalism in England, would ay that in Ireland that system would ean the promotion of Ultramontanism, nd that they would tell him that even t the cost of losing the valuable support f the Member for Dundalk they would o as they had done since the establishment of the system of the late Lord Derby—give their support to the precious principle of undenominational education n Ireland. He regretted that the Amendment of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council was not before the House in print, in order that they might consider what Amendments ought to be ntroduced into it. Of course, the Government, with the aid of their new Irish allies, would overpower the Opposition and carry their Amendment, and they would not be met by any factious opposition. [*Ironical Cheers.*] He was glad to hear that ironical cheer, but he would remind the House that although he had moved the Adjournment of the House last night it was now acknowledged on all sides, even by the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), that the course he had adopted had led to the best results. At least, it had enabled the Government to place before the House what one of their leading Friends considered to be a better proposal. If it were adopted it would still be open to him (Mr. Fawcett) to raise the question whether the power should be optional or compulsory, and, accordingly, he begged to give Notice that at the proper time he would move the omission from the Amendment of the words, "it shall be the duty of the Guardians," in order to substitute the word "may" for "shall," so as to leave Boards of Guardians in the same position that school boards now occupied.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, that as the House was desirous to go to a division, he would intrude briefly upon their time. For himself, he did not care whence the settlement of that difficult question originated if it only proved satisfactory; and as the hon. Member for Hackney claimed the credit of the satisfactory settlement which he hoped was about to be arrived at, he was quite willing that the hon. Gentleman should have all the credit that was due to him in the matter. The hon. Member also said that it was a strong measure to put this duty upon the Guardians without consulting them. But they had reason to know that the bulk of the Guardians would not object to the duty in question. The 14th clause already applied to about half the Boards of Guardians in the country, and not one word of remonstrance had been received from any one of them, and he thought they would be glad to have the means of putting a check on unnecessary local expenditure. Again, it had been urged by hon. Gentlemen opposite that the proposed change would demoralize and pauperize the people. But the system had been in operation since 1872 in Scotland, and its operation had been found to be satisfactory. How could it be urged, then, that that which was good for Scotland could be demoralizing and pauperizing in England? Contributions had been made from various quarters to the solution of the question, which had been thoroughly discussed with great advantage, and he trusted the House would feel that they were now in a position to come to a decision on the subject.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, that he had so recently come into the House that he felt reluctant to trespass on its time, being of opinion he should best show his respect for the Assembly he was so proud to enter by refraining from addressing it while inexperienced in its Forms and Practice. But the question under consideration was one in which he was so deeply interested, and one in which he had taken so considerable a part personally, that it seemed to him it would be hardly honest if he were to remain silent and refrain from stating to the House the opinions which he had formed upon the subject. The noble Lord who had just sat down (Viscount Sandon) said that they were, he hoped, about to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of the question. He (Mr. Chamberlain) feared that the House could not be congratulated upon any such result. As far as his practical experience went, the grievance the noble Lord proposed to remedy had been considerably exaggerated, while the effect of the new agitation to be created by the Amendment which was now proposed had been altogether underestimated. Allusion in the course of the debates upon the Bill had frequently been made to the School Board of Birmingham, to which he hoped hon. Members would at least give credit for honesty of purpose and real educational zeal. The facts in connection with that board had been partially stated by the hon. Member for Plymouth (Mr. Sampson Lloyd). The House was aware that at first the majority of the Birmingham School Board had been elected by a minority of the ratepayers by virtue of the cumulative vote, and that majority endeavoured to enforce compulsion before any board schools existed, and, consequently, before there was any choice of schools. Under the circumstances it became necessary to provide for the payment of the fees of the children of poor parents attending denominational schools, but the feeling created against that course was so strong, hundreds of people declaring that they would rather be distrained upon than pay the "new Church rate," that even the denominationalist majority of the board were unwilling to enforce it, and provision was therefore made for payment of fees in these cases by voluntary subscriptions. It was worthy of remark that the tendency of adopting the principle of paying school fees was to increase them in amount and number. It was found that, when poor parents heard of their neighbours having obtained gratuitous payment of school fees, they made application for similar advantages. When a new election of the school board took place the majority was reversed, and having pushed forward the erection of board schools they carefully considered the question, and decided in all cases to remit the payment of school fees for poor children in board schools, and in no case to pay the fees of children attending voluntary schools. Since that was decided upon no single complaint of hardship had been made. His experience had led him to the conclusion that the religious difficulty was not a parent's difficulty, and that, in fact, very little would be heard of it if the priests and parsons would stand aside. But whether the difficulty arose from the parents or not, they were told that a real grievance arose from parents being compelled to accept education for their children in schools where no religious instruction was provided. The Birmingham School Board had adopted the principle of complete separation of religious and secular education—which was a very different thing from adopting a system of purely secular education. Mr. Cobden once said there were only two ways in which a national system of education could be enforced with any pretence of fairness. One was to have a religious education, and pay for the religions of all alike, and the other to adopt a secular system. Hon. Members opposite seemed inclined to adopt the former alternative, but Roman Catholics would not be content with the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Warwickshire's proposal that the Protestant Bible should be read and taught in all schools. For Roman Catholics religious instruction must be given by the priest, or some one authorized by the priesthood; and special provision must also be made for other sects. They had therefore to distinguish in this matter of the rights of conscience. They had to ask themselves, while admitting that they had no right to enforce upon any man religious teaching which he disapproved, whether they were prepared to provide for him the religious teaching which he wanted. He did not think it was infringing the legitimate rights of conscience to decline such an extortionate demand as that. We made members of the Society of Friends pay war taxes, and held the Peculiar People responsible for the death of relatives to whom they had given no medical assistance. These were cases in which the State held it right to put aside the so-called rights of conscience, and they had a similar right to resist the demands of Roman Catholics and other sects that their religion should be paid for at e expense of those who did not be- ve in it. The Birmingham School oard, in adopting a complete separa- n of the two systems were far from ing hostile to religious education. e hon. Member for Dundalk (Mr. llan) seemed to have arrived at the nclusion that a secular school was of cessity an infidel school—an opinion hich had not always been held by embers of the Catholic Church, for he und that at that moment the Roman tholic ecclesiastics in the United States ere contending that the schools ought be made secular, because they con- dered it an injustice to them that the rotestant Bible should be taught at eir expense. The Birmingham Board ere only endeavouring to carry out in ractice the principles which were laid own for the settlement of the Irish ducation difficulty; and 10 years ago e Primate of Ireland and half of his ishops signed a Memorial in favour of ecular as against denominational reli- ious teaching in that country. It was aid that the Bill was the logical out- ome of the Act of 1870. He was not repared to contest that. The scheme f separate religious instruction was also n outcome of that Act. It was laid down hen that there should be a separation of he time between secular and religious ducation, and at Birmingham they had nly carried the thing a step further than hat Act by separating the teacher and he cost. The Birmingham plan had he support of the majority of the reli- ious people in Birmingham. It was elieved that by throwing religious in- truction on voluntary effort they would ecure much more satisfactory results. He deprecated the statements of those who said that this plan was to the eter- al disgrace of Birmingham, and denied he right of any one to put forward such a charge. There was more religious instruction given to the children of Birmingham, and it was more complete, efficient, satisfactory, and universal, than at any previous period. There were in the Nonconformist Sunday schools above 36,000 children, being almost equal to the whole number in attendance at public elementary schools; and if the Church and other schools were taken into account, it might fairly be estimated that 30 or 40 per cent more children were in receipt of separate religious education than were required to be provided for in public elementary schools. A great deal had been said about the right of a parent to have the choice of schools. Let hon. Gentlemen opposite carry that principle to its logical conclusion and apply it to the rural districts, instead of leaving 10,000 or 12,000 country parishes with only Church schools. The right of conscience, he thought, was becoming a geographical expression. In the towns it meant the right of every one to get his religion taught at the expense of every one else, while in the country it was the right of the Church to drive the children into her schools and enforce the payment of a rate more obnoxious than the old church rate, because it was levied not merely for the maintenance of the fabric of the Church, but for the teaching of her principles and doctrines. He looked with alarm at the probable effect of the proposed Amendment. It would throw into the election of Boards of Guardians all the discord and confusion that frequently attended school board elections, and would not tend to bring about the perfection of religious instruction that was desired. As a general rule Boards of Guardians refused to appoint Roman Catholic chaplains in workhouses, and he thought it probable that they would use every legal means to avoid contributing towards the cost of educating Catholic children in the Catholic faith. In conclusion, he felt bound to say that the Amendment raised a most important principle—a principle which had agitated this country in past times, and which would agitate it again. He deeply regretted it should have been brought forward at the eleventh hour, and he considered it would justify even a factious opposition on the part of hon. Gentlemen on his side of the House. The clause would lead to future opposition, which, he believed, would be detrimental to the cause of education. He thanked the House for having listened to him so attentively.

Captain NOLAN said, that there was one point in the able and temperate speech of the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) which was open to misconstruction. When he said the object of the Amendment was to get districts to pay for the religion of everybody else, he forgot that in Ireland the principal portion of the population was Catholic, and that that country contributed £3,000,000 to the Revenue in excess of what was spent in Ireland.

Mr. HOPWOOD opposed the Amendment. He was no party to any compromise upon the question, and he adhered to his opinion that the proposed Amendment would be a monstrous interpolation in the Bill at that late period. They were told that they should give up their opposition because a compromise had been brought about by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster); but it was really no compromise at all. He saw no practical difference between that which was refused last night, because it was a complete reversal of the settlement of 1870. He contended that their action last night was not factious. They were bound to resist, by every Form of the House, proposals that went to the very root of the existing system of treating board schools and voluntary schools. That system was accepted with the utmost professions of gratitude from hon. Gentlemen opposite to the right hon. Member for Bradford and the then Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone) for their concession on the point. The 25th clause gave an option to the school boards to pay for poor children; and now it was proposed to substitute for them a more objectionable body, and to destroy the option which had hitherto existed. He could not approve the course pursued by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford. He would treat with respect everything that came from that right hon. Gentleman except upon this matter. The present proposal had the same vices as that of last night; and the object of the Members opposite in supporting it probably was a desire to protect voluntary schools against board schools. The different religious communities could provide for the school fees of the children which belonged to them, and there would be really no difficulty in the matter. In that respect he fully coincided with what had been said by the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), whose ability he thought, had been so fully shown in a speech which must have been listened to with attention and pleasure by all who heard it. In conclusion, he would warn those who thought that by the clause they had bound down Boards of Guardians hand and foot to pay these fees. They might find themselves mistaken, because the Guardians might take it into their heads to inquire whether the parents were really unable to pay, and that fact made it even more unwise to raise this great stumbling-block again. He felt he was perfectly justified in making one more appeal to the House to vote against the course proposed by the Government.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER explained that it was not he who had offered the compromise, and for his part he thought that it was a most unfortunate thing that the question should have been mooted at all. No ingenuity could have suggested anything more likely to prevent their coming to a speedy and amicable conclusion of these debates. He was sorry, therefore, the question had been mooted; but, once made, he found it impossible, with any degree of consistency with his previous action, not to admit that the proposition as now brought forward by the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Sandon) was a just one. He thought that the change thus produced in the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath (Lord Robert Montagu) entirely justified the action of the Opposition last night. It had given the Government time to think over the matter, and he thought upon the whole that the proposition of the noble Lord was such as in consistency he could not vote against. At the same time, it must be understood he was only speaking his own view, and not for anybody else. It gave him great pain not to vote with his Friends; but his opinion had been formed with great care, and he could not act otherwise. Without going into the whole question, he would say a few words as to what would be the practical effect of the change in reference to the payment of fees by substituting Guardians for school boards. He believed that the effect would be to enormously diminish the amount of fees to be paid, and the Guardians would be better qualified than the school boards to judge of the question of poverty. Hitherto, except in two or three towns, the question had been theoretical rather than practical; but he had not the least doubt that in Manchester and Salford, at any rate, the number of parents who would be relieved by Boards of Guardians would show a diminution of from 50 to 75 per cent. Another practical dvantage would be that school boards ould be relieved from any discussion the matter, and after a short time e Boards of Guardians would take it a mere matter of business. In conclusion, he begged to join in congratulating the hon. Member for Birmingham Ir. Chamberlain) on the remarkable bility with which he had realized the xpectations entertained by many hon. embers of that House.

MR. STEVENSON declared that he as returned at the General Election to ppose the 25th clause; but he could ot have anticipated that he should have give the opposition to an attempt by e Government to amplify the operaon of that clause. It was contrary to ound principle that money derived from ocal rates should be given to schools ot under local management. He did ot object to the Amendment on account f the money that would have to be aid. He believed it would be less han was paid at present. But it was ecause it raised a principle of the reatest importance that he felt bound vote against the Amendment.

Question put, "That the words proosed to be left out stand part of the ill."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 77; Noes 75: Majority 98.

MR. FAWCETT, in pursuance of the Notice he had already given, moved to mend the clause in relation to the ayment of the fee by the Guardians y omitting the words, "it shall be the uty of," in order to insert words proiding that the Guardians might pay it if hey thought fit. He desired to make one nore effort to minimize the evil of the ourse taken by the Government by naking this proposal not compulsory, out permissive. He called upon the Government to give some cogent reason or a sudden change of policy. When he Bill for repealing the 25th clause of he Act of 1870 was brought forward on hat—the Liberal—side of the House, hon. and right hon. Gentlemen, then in Opposition and now in office, resisted he proposal, on the ground that the lause had worked admirably, and its permissive power had never been abused. He should, therefore, like to know why they now thought the power should be made compulsory. If his Amendment were carried, those districts which had no school boards would be left exactly in the same position as those which had school boards.

Amendment proposed, in page 6, line 14, to leave out the words "it shall be the duty of."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

VISCOUNT SANDON said, that one of the strongest arguments in favour of the proposal which was now made by the Government was the importance and convenience of having one uniform system throughout the country. As far as could be ascertained by the testimony of hon. Members from Scotland, the plan of making it necessary to prove poverty to the satisfaction of the Parochial Board, so that they might provide the fees for poor children, had worked admirably well, and it would be unwise not to take note of that success. By the change proposed the payments would be very much reduced, and the Government were most anxious to minimize them. It was a thing most undesirable in itself that the public money should be applied in these payments; but to pay the fees out of public funds in cases of extreme necessity was a necessary corollary of any plan of compulsory education, and the only question was whether the power should be allowed to school boards, or confined to Boards of Guardians. If the Government proposal were carried as it stood it would remove those dissensions which constantly arose as to whether they should pay or not fees in schools not belonging to them, which had not seldom been injurious to the working of the school boards. Parliament would now, once for all, he hoped, take the responsibility itself of settling the matter, so as to remove this fertile source of dissension from school boards. There was no religious question involved, but only the question of poverty, and the Government hoped that this change would diminish the pressure of local expense. He thought the House must feel that the Government could not consent to make it permissive to the Boards of Guardians to pay fees in cases where it was proved the parents could not pay them, as they would thus introduce into the Boards of Guardians the system already at work in the school boards with its concomitant train of dissensions, the very evil so much complained of in the school boards.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he had examined the Amendment with the hope that he could agree to it, but he had been unable to do so. He did not see why the obligation should be permissive in the one country and obligatory in the other.

Mr. BRISTOWE supported the Amendment. If the powers given by the clause were transferred to the Boards of Guardians, due regard ought to be paid to the interests of those who were unable to pay the rates.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 176; Noes 72: Majority 104.

Mr. BRISTOWE proposed the insertion of words to provide that the payment of school fees by Boards of Guardians should be subject to regulations approved from time to time by the Education Department.

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, line 15, after the word "inability," to insert the words "subject to such regulations as they may make from time to time with the approval of the Education Department."—(*Mr. Bristowe.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Viscount SANDON said, he could not accept the proposal, as he was most anxious that the granting of relief in the form of school fees should be entirely in the hands of the local authorities, who were most competent to judge in these matters, and should have the full responsibility of their actions.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER took a similar view.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. RAMSAY proposed in page 6, line 18, to leave out the words—

"The parent shall not by reason of any such payment made under this section be deprived of any franchise, right, or privilege, or be subject to any disability or disqualification,"

and said that the omission of those words would assimilate the provisions of the Bill in this respect to the law as it existed in Scotland. It had never been determined that the payment of school fees for a child would impose disability of any kind on the parent. He did not believe it would, and the words he proposed to omit were therefore unnecessary.

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, line 18, to leave out the words "The parent shall not by reason of any such payment made under this section be deprived of any franchise, right, or privilege, or be subject to any disability or disqualification."—(*Mr. Ramsay.*)

Mr. E. JENKINS supported the Amendment. Unless the words were struck out, the people of Scotland would be subject to disabilities under which the people of England did not labour. It would be a gross injustice if they did not in this respect treat the Englishman in the same way as they treated the Scotchman, and reduce him to the condition of a pauper.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER reminded the House that the Act of 1870 did not disfranchise the parent unless where he was in receipt of parochial relief.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR would like to see the pauperizing provision taken out of the Scotch Act.

Mr. CHARLEY opposed the Amendment on the ground that it would be unfair to drive members of the independent working class down to the condition of paupers, simply because they had been compelled by misfortune to seek temporary assistance for the education of their children.

Mr. HALL characterized the proposal as a monstrous one to compel a man to send his child to school, and then punish him because he was unable to pay the school fees.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that if the working classes were to be deprived not only of the earnings of their children but also of their civil rights, they would curse the day on which the Education Bill was passed.

Mr. RODWELL observed that the omission of the words then would be a strange inconsistency in the clause as amended by the right hon. Member for Bradford.

Mr. LOWE supported the Amendment, on the ground that not to pass it would create an invidious distinction between the laws of Scotland and England. Then there was another important point. It was extremely desirable that we should have our law uniform, and our law went on the strict rule of scouraging pauperism. But if we id to the poor man—"Though you do thing for your children we will re- ve you from all *quasi*-penal conse- ences," the result would be to en- urage men to do as little as possible r their children.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER entered his otest against the notion that every- ing that was good for Scotland would good for England. He attached ry little importance to a uniformity hich was something like the uniformity ught by the fox which had lost its tail.

Viscount SANDON said, it should be membered that we were only following this respect the provisions of the Act 1870, and his hon. Friends on both des would recollect the point was very uch discussed, at the time of passing at Act, and that there was great differ- ce of opinion on the subject. Though great deal might be said in favour of e omission of these words, still dis- anchisement was a serious thing. hen we were introducing compulsion would be a very serious matter to in- oduce also the principle of disfranchise- ent, and he was of opinion that, not- ithstanding what was asserted as to e example of Scotland, though he as very doubtful whether, as a matter f fact, disfranchisement did follow in cotland the payment of fees by the arochial authorities, they had better ave things in this respect as they were t present.

Mr. MUNDELLA said, that tempo- ary assistance, whether in the shape of emission or otherwise, ought not to be matter of disqualification.

Mr. RAMSAY, in order to save the me of the House, proposed to withdraw he Amendment.

Mr. HOPWOOD objected to its being ithdrawn.

Mr. FAWCETT wished it to be known hat the noble Lord the Vice President f the Council, after persuading the louse to accept his Amendment on the nderstanding that he was about to stablish a uniform system for the whole ountry, had now turned round and re- used to adopt those safeguards which in cotland prevented abuse of the power o remit fees.

Question put, "That the words pro- osed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 159; Noes 42: Majority 117.

And it being after ten minutes before Seven of the clock, further proceeding on Consideration of the Bill was adjourned till *this day.*

Mr. J. COWEN appealed to the Government for merciful consideration, as they had now got education on the brain. Instead of going on with the Bill that evening, it would be better to meet on Saturday.

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out that, according to the Rules of the House, the debate must stand adjourned until the evening.

In reply to Mr. Goschen,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, it was intended to take the third reading of the Bill to-morrow, and then Supply, with the Votes for Mr. Cave's Mission to Egypt.

And it being now Seven of the clock, the House suspended its Sitting.

The House resumed its sitting at Nine of the clock.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

REPORT ON THE FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS ACTS—THE RESOLUTION.

QUESTION.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER asked the hon. Member for Leeds (Mr. Tennant) to postpone to some future occasion his Motion respecting the Report of the Commission upon the working of the Factory and Workshops Acts. If that were done the House might proceed at once with the further consideration of the Amendments to the Education Bill.

Mr. TENNANT said, he could not resist the appeal made by the right hon. Baronet, and would, accordingly, postpone his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *postponed.*

PARLIAMENT—ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER wished to know, Whether Mr. Chancellor of the

Exchequer could give the House any information as to the Business to be taken up to-morrow and Monday?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, the Government proposed to proceed with the third reading of the Education Bill to-morrow, at 12. If that did not occupy too much time they would go into Supply and proceed with the Votes on the Suez Canal and Mr. Cave's Mission. The third Order of the Day would be the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, and if they were unable to get through the Committee of Supply to-morrow the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill would be taken on Monday. Probably the Cruelty to Animals Bill would be taken on Tuesday or Wednesday.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.
[BILL 277.]

(*Viscount Sandon, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

FURTHER PROCEEDINGS ON CONSIDERATION.

Further proceedings [4th August] on Consideration of the Bill, as amended, *resumed.*

Clause 14 (Payment of school fees for poor parents).

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he wished to propose an addition to the clause. In his opinion it would be better if school boards had not the power to give away public money. The Guardians would have better opportunities than the school boards could have of testing the real inability of parents to pay school fees. He therefore proposed to add at the end of the clause the words—"The 25th section of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, is hereby repealed."

Viscount SANDON said, he was glad to accept the Amendment on the authority of the right hon. Gentleman. He agreed that the provisions now made in the Bill would introduce greater economy in the relief given to indigent parents by confining such relief to persons who really needed it, and so reduce to a minimum payment out of the rates for supplementing the school fees. That was what those who had studied the educational question were most anxious to obtain. It was a matter of very great satisfaction to him that, after their various discussions, they should come to this point, for the Amendment would remove a very unnecessary bone of contention in connection with school boards, and the fear could hardly any longer be entertained that the rates were applied by favour to denominational schools to assist them, and not in cases only of absolute necessity, to enable poor parents to comply with the law, and send their children to the school of their choice.

Mr. CHARLEY thought it would be inconvenient to introduce that repealing clause in the middle of the Bill, and would suggest that the better course would be to place the 25th clause in the schedule among the repealed enactments. In Salford the 25th clause had worked admirably, and he only hoped that the Guardians of Salford would carry out the law as satisfactorily as it had been carried out by the school board of Salford, who had exhibited the greatest tact and delicacy in administering the ratepayers' bounty. He had some regret at the repeal of the 25th clause, but he regretted the way it had been worked in London, where the names and addresses of the parents who had been relieved by the school board were advertised in *The Times.*

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY congratulated the right hon. Gentleman who had introduced the 25th clause upon his great good fortune in being able to withdraw it. Roman Catholics had great reason to be grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for the consistency and moral courage he had shown upon this question. Irish Roman Catholics had, however, great grievances—those relating to University education and to middle class education.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *added.*

Clause 15 (Establishment, &c., by day industrial schools).

Viscount SANDON moved, as an Amendment, in page 6, lines 27 and 28, to leave out "an industrial school in which children are not lodged," in order to insert a better definition of a day industrial school, to which definition he had been greatly helped by the hon. Member for Paisley (Mr. W. Holms). It was as follows:—

> “A school in which industrial training, ele- ntary education, and one or more meals a y, but not lodging, are provide for the ldren.”

ıe object was to exclude the possibility making clothing a charge upon the tes.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *sub- tuted.*

Viscount SANDON, in moving, as an nendment, in page 8, at end of clause, insert as new paragraphs—

> “A Secretary of State may from time to time ıke, and when made revoke, and vary the rms of orders for sending a child to a day lustrial school, and the manner in which chil- en are to be sent to such school.
>
> “If a Secretary of State is of opinion that, reason of a change of circumstances or other- se, a certified day industrial school ceases to necessary or expedient for the proper train- g and control of the children of any class of pulation in the neighbourhood of that school, may, after due notice, withdraw the certifi- te of the school, and thereupon such school all cease to be a certified day industrial hool.
>
> “Provided, That the reasons for withdrawing ch certificate shall be laid before both Houses Parliament within one month after notice the withdrawal is given, if Parliament be en sitting, or if not, within one month after e then next meeting of Parliament,”

ıid, the Amendment, which was in ccordance with the feeling of both des of the House, would enable the ecretary of State to keep watch on the rowth of these schools; and, as the overnment had great hope that after certain term of years they would have one their work in many places, by ivilizing the children in them, and fit- ng them for better schools, it would rengthen his hands in saying to the enevolent people or local authorities vho might have established them, that hey were no longer needed for the ocality, and that therefore the State vould not any longer support them.

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE aid, that the clause had met with uni- ersal condemnation from those gentle- nen who took an interest in industrial chools. They entertained three funda- nental objections to it—First, they had ıo security whatever that the parent vould make the payment required of ıim under the clause; secondly, a child y going home of an evening would be leprived of all the benefit he might ıave obtained from the education given ıim during the day; and thirdly, the lause, which for the first time introduced a system of what might be called feeding the population at the expense of the ratepayers and the State, would have a gigantic effect in the way of degrading and demoralizing the poorer classes. If once they began to provide food, the question would next arise whether they ought not also to be clothed at the public expense. Owing also to the migratory character of the population of the large towns, it would be impossible to keep the children in the schools to which they had been committed, or to recover the sums due on their behalf from the parents. He could not see that any of the Amendments proposed in the clause in the least removed these objections, and he must enter his emphatic protest against it.

Mr. A. MILLS said, he must remind the noble Lord the Member for Calne (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice) that there was a class of children in London who were not fit subjects for the prison or the workhouse, or for the existing elementary schools, and who ought to be provided for in some such way as that now proposed. No doubt it would be better to have lodging schools, but how was Parliament to provide the funds necessary to establish institutions of that kind?

Amendment *agreed to;* paragraphs *inserted.*

Clause 16 (Conditions of contribution to day industrial schools).

On the Motion of Viscount Sandon, Clause *amended,* by leaving out in page 8, line 17, “shall conform to the standards,” and inserting—

> “To be recommended by the Secretary of State shall provide for the examination of the children according to the standards of proficiency.”

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH moved to add at the end of the preceding Amendment a provision that the amount of the contribution should be dependent in each case on the results of the examination.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 8, after the word “proficiency,” at the end of the last Amendment, to insert the words “and shall provide that the amount of the contribution shall be dependent upon the results of such examination.”—(*Lord Frederick Cavendish.*)

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, that the Secretary of State already had power to vary the amount of the contribution according to the Standard in which the child passed; and, that being so, it was undesirable to draw a hard-and-fast line.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR observed that he quite concurred in the Secretary of State having a discretion in the matter; but he still thought that unless the Amendment were agreed to, they would fall into the same error in the industrial schools of the future as they had done in those of the past.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Clause 18 (Supplemental provisions as to certificates of proficiency and previous attendance at school).

On the Motion of Lord Frederick Cavendish, Clause amended, in page 9, line 13, at end, by adding—

"All regulations made by the Education Department under this section shall be laid before Parliament in the same manner as minutes of the Education Department."

Clause 19 (Certificates of birth for purposes of Act).

On the Motion of Viscount Sandon, Clause amended, in page 9, line 20, after "fee," by inserting "not exceeding one shilling as the Local Government Board from time to time fix."

Clause 25 (Dissolution of school board under certain circumstances).

Viscount SANDON moved as an Amendment, in page 11, line 30, to leave out "three," and insert "six." The hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had in Committee on the Bill proposed that the time should be within three months of the election of the Board; and the Government had kept the limit open for re-consideration on the Report. He now proposed that six months before the date of the election should be substituted for three months, as the maximum limit—an arrangement which would be more convenient.

Amendment *ageeed to;* word *substituted.*

Clause 28 (Provisions as to school attendance committee and appointment of local committee).

Mr. EARP proposed an Amendment, providing that no member of any local committee appointed under the Act should sit as a member of the court of summary jurisdiction in any proceeding instituted at the instance of such local committee.

Amendment proposed,

In page 13, line 11, after the word "Act," to insert the words "nor shall any member of such local committee sit as a member of the court of summary jurisdiction in any proceeding instituted at the instance of such local committee."—(*Mr. Earp.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir WALTER BARTTELOT hoped that the Government would not accept the Amendment.

Viscount SANDON objected to the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Other Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

POLLUTION OF RIVERS BILL.

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt.*)

[BILL 276.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

Mr. DILLWYN, in moving that the Bill be read a third time on that day month, said, he thought it ought not to be passed at that time of the Session, for it was not at all like the measure originally brought in by the Government. He thought the Bill as introduced, though not a very strong one, would have done some good. Since then, however, material modifications had been introduced, the effect being that the manufacturing interests, who at first opposed it, were now in favour of the Bill. He complained of the insertion, without adequate Notice, of the 16th clause, by which a manufacturer might continue to pollute a river for three years, if he had received a certificate from the Local Government Board, without being subject to interdict or injunction. He protested against such a clause as perfectly monstrous. He should have been glad if the Bill had been re-committed with a view to the withdrawal of that clause, for the Bill on the whole was a good one; but, as the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill would not consent to that suggestion, he was obliged to ppose the third reading. He therefore noved the rejection of the Bill.

Amendment proposed, to leave out he word "now," and at the end of the uestion to add the words "upon this ay month."—(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

Question proposed, "That the word now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. ANDERSON supported the Bill. He was surprised at the inconsistency of he hon. Member for Swansea in protesting against what he called Lobby egislation, and then stating that he had himself privately endeavoured to nake arrangements with a Member of the Government as to the form of the Bill. The measure was not such a dreadful one after all, for the clause to which his hon. Friend referred only enabled a manufacturer who had procured a certificate from the Local Government Board to carry on his works for three years free from injunction and interdict, but still as much as ever exposed to an action for damages. In other words, the clause only took away the extreme remedy of stopping the works and driving the people out of employment. The idea was that, much as they desired the purity of the river, they considered that the welfare of the great manufacturing interests, by which the people lived, ought not to be lost sight of, and was of greater national importance than even the purifying of the streams.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the Bill certainly had not been prominently before the House, but it was discussed on the second reading and in Committee. As soon as it passed through Committee it was reprinted for the information of those hon. Members who had placed Amendments on the Paper. He denied that the clause had been inserted in the Bill without adequate Notice. On the contrary, full Notice had been given of it, and it had been accepted by the House. The House was tolerably full when this clause was added to the Bill, and it had the support of several hon. Gentlemen of authority and eminence in the House. It was to the effect that procedure by way of injunction should not be had recourse to during the existence of one of these certificates, but they were not to be granted for more than three years, and only where works of purification were actually in operation; while any person aggrieved might appeal to the governing authorities to cancel the certificate. He looked upon that as a reasonable proposal, and if it were desirable that the language of it should be reviewed, there could scarcely, he contended, be a better tribunal for the purpose than the House of Lords. The clause had been carefully drawn, and did not seem to him to be likely to produce any mischief.

Sir HENRY JAMES, adverting to the fact that the Bill had been on a former occasion, by a slip of the tongue, described by right hon. Gentleman as a measure for the better pollution of rivers, suggested that the description was prophetic of its real character as it now stood, for yielding had gone so far that in order to secure the passing of the measure, the Government had conceded so much that it had become the manufacturers' Bill instead of the Bill originally introduced by the Government. If the design was to carry the Bill now, and to follow it up with another next year, the better way would be to throw the Bill out at once. The opposition to the Bill chiefly arose from manufacturers, who set their own private interests up in opposition to those of the general public. Their interests should not stand in the way of the purity of rivers. The streams were poisoned by the refuse of the manufacturing ingredients discharged into them. By the absence of proper means of prevention, the pollution of rivers that ought for sanitary purposes to be pure, was allowed to go on, and he held that it was a dangerous principle to give an Inspector power to prevent the local authorities from putting a stop to a nuisance. The purity of their water must be an object of great anxiety to every hon. Member of that House.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, the House had listened to the very able speech made by the hon. and learned Gentleman, which might have been more appropriately made in Committee. He was inclined to think from his speech that the hon. and learned Gentleman had not read the Bill, or, at all events, that he had not understood it. If he had, he would scarcely have spoken of it in the terms which he had used. There were three great questions in connection with river pollution. First, there was the question of the introduction into rivers of solid matter. Secondly, the pollution of rivers not only by solid matter, but by sewage; and, thirdly, there was a pollution by manufactories, and on this last point especially they had to consider existing interests. For dealing with these evils various Bills had at different times been introduced. All of them had failed, because they attempted too much; and his right hon. Friend, in view of that fact, had wisely confined his measure within certain limits. The hon. and learned Gentleman's description of it, however, was not quite accurate, as he himself would see if he condescended to study its provisions. No one who visited the North of England could fail to notice that the rivers there were gradually becoming choked up with the solid refuse thrown into them, and the injury thus caused to the people living on their banks was incalculable. In the neighbourhood of some of the large towns in his own county the expense incurred in dredging these rivers was enormous. Now, if the hon. and learned Member had made himself acquainted with the clauses relating to that part of the subject, he would have seen that they embodied most important provisions, and that the remedy was absolute and complete. The Bill also dealt completely with that great source of the pollution of rivers arising from sewage; and if there were nothing else in the measure but the means of preventing that great cause of injury to the public health, and also to the cattle feeding on the banks of rivers, it would be well worth the House's while to pass it. With regard to the pollution produced through manufactories, it was a great step to stop, as the Bill would do, the further pollution of rivers by manufactories to be hereafter established. With respect to that part of the evil created by existing manufactories, and as to which they had to deal with vested interests, they must proceed in these matters by degrees, and he believed that his right hon. Friend (Mr. Sclater-Booth) had gone as far as the late Government or any other Government could, or as the public would allow him to go.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, it might be true that the Bill went as far as public opinion would sanction at that period of the Session; but it should be remembered that they had as yet had no discussion on that important measure except at the small hours of the morning, and that if it became law it would have been settled by arrangements made in the Lobby. The House could not now pass a Bill such as they would wish to pass, and an imperfect measure like the present one would not really facilitate the further work of legislation which would have to be done on that subject. He would not recommend the House to divide, but he would remind the Government that they could not claim to have done all that was necessary for the prevention of the pollution of rivers. The Bill was a paltry and hesitating one, and was passed at the end of the Session as a shift to enable the Government to say that they had carried a measure on the subject.

Mr. LOCKE said, the speech they had just heard was a difficult one to understand. They had now a Bill which, it was admitted, would do a great deal of good, and yet the argument seemed to be this, that if they could not now deal with the whole matter it would be better not to touch it. That, however, was not the ordinary rule that human beings adopted. The Bill was founded upon this proposition that we should go as far as we could in the right direction. The Bill would have ample field for action in Wales, which, though a very beautiful country, had no fish in its polluted streams. He thought the Bill, as far as it went, was one which should be passed, and that they ought not to wait until more could be done. Well, then, his right hon. and excellent Friend (Mr. Goschen) said it was too late in the Session to pass this Bill. If that was a reason for not passing the Bill, he was afraid they would have very few Bills passed. There was an opportunity now of setting things right and of giving the people pure water to drink, which he hoped would not be lost.

Mr. CLARE READ said, that during the summer and autumn of last year he was engaged in investigating the sewage question. He then found that the rivers of the North of England were polluted to an enormous extent by solid matter put into them and by sewage. This Bill would effectually meet those two points. The pollution of rivers by manufactories with dye was not one quarter so bad as the pollution by sewage. This was by far the most practical, the most simple, and most straightforward measure that had been proposed on the subject. If anything remained to be done further in that direction this Bill would have laid a good foundation for further progress.

Mr. MONK said, he would much rather that the Bill had been recommitted, for the purpose of striking out the objectionable clauses, than that it should be rejected. He thought it was most unfair that common law rights should be taken away as they were by one clause in the Bill, but he hoped the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) would not press his Amendment for its rejection.

Mr. HICK said, the interests of the manufacturers in the rivers were very great, but a great deal might be done to purify the rivers without detriment to the manufacturers. The Bill, though it did not go far enough, would to a certain extent satisfy, not only the manufacturers, but the riparian owners, and it would go a long way towards the suppression of an intolerable nuisance in Lancashire, where, as in his own case, they had been obliged to keep all the windows of the house closed in order to keep out the unwholesome stench of the river Ribble.

Mr. YEAMAN said, this was a Bill in the right direction. He hoped it would be read a third time.

Mr. BIRLEY supported the Bill, though he was not altogether satisfied with it. He thought the manufacturers had a right to a certain degree of consideration.

Mr. STEVENSON thought it would be a hard thing if after manufacturers had gone to a great expense to get a certificate it should not stand them in good stead.

Mr. DILLWYN said, the House seemed to be in favour of passing the Bill, and he would not, therefore, give it the trouble to divide.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[BILL 96.]

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Assheton Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

The LORD ADVOCATE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, explained the nature of the Sheriff Courts, pointing out that they were important, bringing, as they did, the administration of justice to the doors of the less wealthy classes, who could not go to the Superior Courts. He did not intend to proceed with the clauses extending the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts to real property, which he would take up next year. The Bill before the House, therefore, simply aimed at reforming the procedure of those Courts, and applied the improvement effected in the Court of Session to the Sheriff Courts. [The right hon. and learned Gentleman read a communication from the attorneys in Glasgow, expressing approval of the Bill, and showing the character of the measure.] It was important, he said, in the interests of Scotland, that the Bill should pass, and, if desirable, be amended in Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Mr. ANDERSON, in moving, as an Amendment, that it was inexpedient to legislate on this matter without extending the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts, said, he must remind the House of the circumstances under which a Bill similar to this was brought in last Session by the Lord Advocate. He himself had then a Bill before the House for extending the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts to questions of heritable right, and he had been induced to withdraw that Bill on the pledge of the Lord Advocate to carry that reform in a Government Bill. The Lord Advocate had failed to carry his Bill last year, and the present Bill was its successor. The hon. and learned Lord now proposed to carry his Bill only after striking out the jurisdiction extension clauses, and when all that remained was some clauses to amend procedure, probably very good in themselves, but certainly not the main object of the Bill. The Sheriff Courts had an unlimited authority respecting personal property, but could not interfere with real property, and the effect of that was that great injustice was done to certain suitors by cases being unnecessarily taken to Edinburgh by the wealthy suitor and to the prejudice of the poorer. He objected to that part of the Bill relating to the extension of jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts being struck out of the Bill for the present Session. They might have the Lord Advocate's pledge that he would embody the provisions with regard to jurisdiction in a Bill next Session, but they could not depend on the Lord Advocate's pledges. They had had two years' experience of them, and they had found that they were not to be relied upon. He did not for a moment mean that the learned Lord was unwilling to redeem his pledges, or made them without the fullest intention of redeeming them; but he seemed to have no weight with the Government. The Government did not allow him any weight or say at all, and it seemed as if Scotland would not get any legislation unless Scotch Members adopted the principle which had been so successfully adopted by the Irish Members—form a Home Rule party, and begin to agitate and unite, and give the Government all sorts of trouble and factious opposition. When the Scotch Members did that, no doubt they would be a little better attended to. He was willing to withdraw his opposition to the second reading of the Bill if the Home Secretary would give Scotch Members a pledge to see that the Lord Advocate next Session brought in a Bill to extend the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts with a Government pledge to do their best to pass it. If he did not receive that pledge, he should divide the House, although he was sure to be defeated, and he should continue his opposition to all the future stages of the measure.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is inexpedient to legislate on this matter without extending the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts,"—(*Mr. Anderson,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, it was no fault of the Lord Advocate that he had been obliged to drop the question of jurisdiction. It was only from extreme pressure that the Bill had been curtailed, but that portion had been retained which was the most important, and which was very much needed. As to the extension of jurisdiction he admitted that time was required for consideration. He was therefore in favour of the postponement. The other parts of the Bill were generally approved of in Scotland, and he hoped the second reading would be taken *pro formâ.* He had consulted with the Lord Advocate, and he would undertake that the right hon. and learned Lord should bring in a Bill next Session dealing with this question of jurisdiction, and pass it through if possible.

Mr. FARLEY LEITH said, there was a general concurrence of opinion in favour of the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts being extended, and he would refer in proof to the Petitions which had been presented from Scotland in favour of it. They amounted to 46 in number, and among the Petitioners were the principal Chambers of Commerce, and only three Petitions were presented against it. These were by solicitors and writers of the signet. But the general community were in favour of that principle. He complained of the manner in which Scotch Business had been treated during the whole of the Session, because it had created general displeasure both amongst the Members of that House and in Scotland.

Mr. M'LAREN said, there was no one he knew of in Scotland who would object to the Sheriff Courts having the same power respecting real property as the County Courts had in England. He should like to see a discreet Bill brought in next Session to extend the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts in Scotland to the same extent as the County Courts in England.

Mr. RAMSAY rejoiced that there was a prospect of the improvement in the administration of the law in the Sheriff Courts, Scotland.

Mr. ANDERSON said, he was satisfied with the pledges given by the Government, and would withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. FARLEY LEITH said, he had a Motion on the paper to the effect that the Bill be read a second time on that day three months, but he would not bring it forward.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

ORFEITURE RELIEF BILL.—[Bill 259.]

(*Mr. Marten, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Gregory.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Notice taken, that 40 Members were ot present; House counted, and 40 embers not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, 5th August, 1876.

MINUTES.] — New Writ Issued — *For* the Borough of Leeds, *v.* Robert Meek Carter, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

Supply—*considered in Committee*—Civil Service Estimates—Class V.

Ways and Means — *considered in Committee*— Consolidated Fund (£28,703,043) *.

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland) [286].

Second Reading—Suez Canal (Shares) * [189]; Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment) * [211]; Legal Practitioners * [43].

Committee—Report—Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment (Dublin) (*re-comm.*) * [207].

Considered as amended—Municipal Privileges (Ireland) [39].

Third Reading—Elementary Education [277], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Registry of Deeds (Ireland) * [233]; Offences against the Person * [1].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

SCOTLAND—THE KING'S PARK AT STIRLING.—QUESTION.

Sir WILLIAM STIRLING-MAXWELL asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it is true that negotiations are on foot between the Commissioners of Woods and the Provost and Magistrates of Stirling for the sale of the King's Park of Stirling by the former to the latter; and, whether the Treasury has sanctioned or is likely to sanction the alienation of that ancient possession of the Crown?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, the Office of Woods had been in negotiation with the provost and magistrates of Stirling for the transfer of the Crown property under the control of the Woods to the authorities of the burgh, subject, however, to the continued exercise by the public of all the rights of way and of recreation over the land which now existed. In deference, however, to the representations which had been made to the Treasury upon the subject, that negotiation had been abandoned and the property would remain in the possession of the Crown.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

(*Viscount Sandon, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

[Bill 277.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."—(*Viscount Sandon.*)

Mr. RICHARD: I wish, before the third reading of this Bill is put from the Chair, to record my last protest against it, and to declare my conviction that it is the worst Bill, the most unjust, the most re-actionary, the most tyrannical in spirit, that has been brought before Parliament since Lord Bolingbroke proposed his Schism Bill in the reign of Queen Anne. The object of that measure was the same as this—to put the education of the people of this country in the hands of the Church of England by discouraging and suppressing all other kinds of education. That failed utterly and ignominiously, as it deserved to fail, and as I hope this also will fail. I believe the Party opposite have taken an unwise as well as an unfair advantage of their position as being temporarily in possession of a great majority. They seem to me to have tried to do everything that was most obnoxious and offensive to this side of the House. They know that a large number of hon. Gentlemen who sit here, as well as a powerful party out-of-doors, attach the greatest importance and value to school boards, because they call in the people themselves to take part in the work of educating their own children. But the Party opposite have been aiming at the very existence of school boards. If all the Amendments they put on the Paper had been carried, it would have brought that existence into imminent jeopardy—and I must say that the noble Lord (Viscount Sandon) himself has done not a little by his speeches to throw discredit on those bodies. Then with regard to denominational schools, there are many of us here, and tens of thousands out-of-doors, who maintain that the attempt to make national education sectarian is an absurdity and a contradiction in terms, and that it is impossible to have a denominational system imposed upon the people with adequate securities for the rights of conscience. And yet, in the face of this, you are, by this Bill, strengthening, and extending, and intensifying the denominational system. Then comes the 25th clause, which, as it existed even under the Act of 1870, was utterly repugnant to large bodies of persons in the country, because it involved the principle of concurrent endowment, making everybody to pay for teaching everybody else's religion, and because it is practically an acknowledgment on the part of the Government of utter indifference as respects religion, since by paying all sects alike it proclaims aloud its belief that all religions are equally true, or equally false, or equally worthless. But by this Bill you make that clause harder than ever by making it compulsory instead of optional. And all this is done on the plea of zeal for religious education. Now, I do not wish to call in question the perfect sincerity of the loud professions which hon. Gentlemen opposite have made of their own religiousness. But I do not think the best way of showing our regard for religion is to put it into an Act of Parliament, and to force it upon others. I must say that when I listened to the vociferous cheers with which hon. Gentlemen opposite have greeted any allusion to the Bible, or the Church, or religious education, I could not help being reminded of Tom Hood's lines—

> "A man may cry Church! Church! at every word,
> With no more piety than other people:
> The daw's not reckoned a religious bird
> Because he keeps caw, cawing from the steeple."

It is curious to observe the effect which the word "secular" produces upon hon. Gentlemen opposite. It seems to have the same effect upon them as it is said a red rag has upon a bull, rousing them into fury. Even my hon. Friend the Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan), whose sound judgment and generous feelings always keep him, in spite of his fervid Celtic temperament, within the bounds of good taste, indulged yesterday in declamations on this subject which filled me with astonishment and some pain, as coming from him. He told the House that secular education would produce only skilful or clever infidels. But do hon. Gentlemen who say such things really mean gravely to aver that all knowledge that is not directly religious or theological is profane and unholy, and has a tendency to produce infidelity? Does my hon. Friend maintain that to teach a child writing, and arithmetic, and grammar, and geography, and geology, and botany, and other natural sciences, will make him an infidel? Now, I venture to say this—that any Church which fears knowledge, though it be but natural knowledge, which wishes to exclude light unless it passes through an ecclesiastical spectrum, through its own

> "Storied windows, richly dight,
> Shedding a dim religious light"

—often a very dim religious light—stands self-condemned, because it fears the truth. Now, if all secular knowledge and all secular pursuits are perilous to the welfare of the soul, what a plight we must be in who sit in this House, for we are generally dealing here with purely secular matters; and I cordially wish we never dealt with any other than secular matters, for I believe that our discussions of religious questions do very little to promote the interests or to foster the spirit of religion. I wish to explain once more to hon. Gentlemen opposite what our views are on this subject. No one wishes the children of our people to be left without religious instruction. I protest against the persistent misrepresentations made on this point. There are many hon. Gentlemen who sit on these Benches who are as deeply and earnestly anxious that the children should be brought up under religious influence as any hon. Gentleman opposite. But what we contend for is, that in a country like ours, where there is so great a diversity of religious opinion, you cannot, in rate-supported or State-supported schools, give religious instruction without trenching on the rights of conscience; that, therefore, the religious instruction must be given at other times and by other persons—in a word, that there must be united secular and separate religious instruction. Hon. Gentlemen opposite who declaim against this principle do not seem to be aware that it was first introduced into the educational system of this country by two great Conservative statesmen, Sir Robert Peel and the late Lord Derby. In 1845 Sir Robert Peel brought forward his scheme for establishing the Queen's Colleges in Ireland. Sir James Graham, in introducing the measure in this House, stated very explicitly that if the projected institutions were to be, as they were intended to be, for the use of men of all creeds in Ireland, it would be impossible to give any theological or religious instruction whatever. Then Sir Robert Harry Inglis—a most admirable man in many respects, though somewhat narrow ecclesiastically — immediately followed Sir James Graham, and inquired whether he was to understand that there was to be no religious instruction given in the Colleges? Sir James Graham assented, and forthwith Sir Robert Inglis denounced the scheme as "a gigantic system of Godless education." And yet that was the system introduced by the Conservative Government of that day, and supported, I believe, by the whole strength of the Conservative Party. Then, in 1832, the late Lord Derby, then Lord Stanley, and Chief Secretary for Ireland under Lord Grey's administration, introduced the Irish system of national education. That was originally intended to be founded on precisely the same principle as that adopted by the Birmingham League, and practised by the Birmingham School Board, of united secular and separate religious instruction. There can be no doubt on this point, because the original draft of Lord Stanley's letter to the Duke of Leinster, in which he expounded his scheme, is still extant. The Royal Commissioners on Irish Education, who reported in 1870, say—

> "In that draft the plan projected by the Government was described as one of combined literary and separate religious instruction, each department altogether to exclude the other."

And Mr. Carlyle, the resident Commissioner of the Irish system of Education, in whose hands really the whole administration of it rested, said in a letter to *The Times* in 1854—

> "The system proposed in Lord Stanley's letter was certainly a system of united secular and separate religious instruction."

But there is another incidental evidence of a curious character to confirm this. Some hon. Gentlemen here may be aware that before the system of national education was introduced in Ireland, the Government used to help education in that country by giving grants to a society known as the Kildare Street Society, something like the British and Foreign School Society. Now all the religious instruction given in the Kildare Street Society's schools, consisted of reading a portion of Scripture at the opening of the school, either from the received version, or the Douay version. And yet Lord Stanley, in his speech in this House, declared that even this minimum of religious instruction was too much for Ireland, because the Roman Catholics objected to the reading of the Scriptures without note or comment. Furthermore, the resident Commissioner, Mr. Carlyle, gave evidence, in 1837, before a Committee of this House, that—

> "It was strictly correct to say that if the term 'school hours' is understood to apply to those hours for which the board supplies tuition, and not merely permits it, the Scriptures cannot be read during school hours in the schools of the board."

He said further, it was considered—

> "That the board does not take cognizance of the religious instruction at all, but that they allow every denomination to take care of itself, through the clergyman." That —"with the separate religious instruction the Commissioners have nothing to do; they have no power of enforcing separate religious instruction at all. If it be not given, the fault is not with the system, but with those who neglect their duty." The Commissioners "employ no one to give the separate instruction beyond the school-house, neither school books, nor other means."

And, as my hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) said yesterday, in 1866 there was a very remarkable declaration made in favour of this system, signed by 2,754 members of the United Churches of England and Ireland. The signatures comprised the Lord Primate of all Ireland; the Lord Justice of Appeal; Noblemen, 45; Bishops, 5; deputy-lieutenants, 146; justices of the peace (not deputy-lieutenants), 146; clergymen, 733; professional men, country gentlemen, and merchants, 800; miscellaneous signatures, about 387; total, 2,754. The declaration says—

> "We, the undersigned members of the United Church of England and Ireland, desire to express our earnest hope that the principle of united secular education, as opposed to the denominational system, may be maintained in Ireland."

And thus hon. Gentlemen will see that the scheme they have been denouncing as some terrible innovation introduced by the Birmingham League, or started by Dissenters to subserve some sinister sectarian purpose, owes its birth to Conservative statesmanship, and has Primates and Bishops for its sponsors. But I can call in a more recent witness, whose testimony will, I am sure, be received with respect by hon. Gentlemen opposite—no other than the hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope). In the discussions that took place on the Bill of 1870, the hon. Gentleman suggested a plan identical with that of the Birmingham League. These are his words—

> "A solution of the religious difficulty might, perhaps, be found in encouraging the different denominations to send voluntary—and, it might be, unpaid — teachers into the rate-created schools to teach religion, these teachers being either laymen or ministers. They would give instruction according to their own formularies to those only who pleased to attend. There is sufficient religious zeal amongst the various denominations to incite them to provide voluntary teachers for day-schools as they now did for Sunday schools."—[3 *Hansard*, ccii. 552.]

Now that is absolutely the plan now in operation in the Birmingham School Board schools, and I really must suggest to my hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham whether he ought not to propose the hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge as honorary Vice President of the Birmingham League. Now, in regard to this Bill, I find it hard to believe that the people of this country will long submit to have the education of their children placed in priestly hands—especially at a time when priestly pretensions are becoming every day more exorbitant and audacious. That this is so I can prove by the authority of a very distinguished Member of this House. The speech from which I am about to quote was delivered at a Church Congress held at Wolverhampton in 1867. The speaker is referring to the hindrance to Church extension, and says—

> "One great hindrance to Church extension is the impression that widely prevails, and I think not without cause, that not only among the High Church clergy, but also among the clergy generally, there is a strong growth of what I may broadly call a priestly feeling. . . . During the last few years every one must have observed more and more, even among clergymen of the Evangelical and moderate party, a steady, quiet, stealthy growth—though without the least guile or sinister intention—of the feeling that the clergy are a priestly order. . . . We believe that that feeling is the parent of great and serious evils. . . . We believe it leads to inordinate multiplication and the burdensome infliction of rites and ceremonie We believe that when the temporal power wi assist, it leads to the extermination of all wh differ from the priestly body. We believe tha the priestly idea leads to the establishment another master in every household, by ever hearth, in the place of the husband and th father. We believe, and history shows us, i all creeds, in all times, and in all countries, th same thing—that this priestly feeling ends i raising up and establishing a human, artificia barrier between man and his God."

Then comes a remark in which I ver cordially concur—

> "Let me remind you that ever since the ar of printing resulted in the distribution of book throughout the country—ever since knowledg ceased to be the exclusive possession of th clergy, there has been no faltering in the deter mination of the people not to have a priestl rule in England."

Now at the head of that speech I fin the name of the noble Lord opposit (Viscount Sandon). And I confess find it hard to understand how the nobl Lord, who, with so much apparent sin cerity, deplores the growth of the priestl feeling among all classes of the clerg of the Church of England, and has de scribed in such graphic language the terrible fruits of that feeling, can have allowed himself to be made the instrument of pressing through this House a Bill the tendency and object of which is to consign the education of the people of this country, to a large extent, at least, into the hands of those very clergy Now, Sir, in conclusion, I wish distinctly to give notice that I, for one, do not accept this Bill as a settlement of the education question. I hope we may consider, after the Motion proposed by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) on the Report, that that is the conclusion of the whole Liberal Party—that we feel ourselves at liberty, whenever we have the opportunity, to reverse the unjust and tyrannical policy embodied in this Bill.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he regretted that he could not vote for the third reading of the Bill. He was not one of those who voted against the second reading, because he thought that it was a distinct educational advance, and because he relied upon the statement of the noble Lord that it was no way intended to reverse the principles of the Act of 1870, or to aggravate the religious difficulty; but, unfortunately, the noble Lord at a later period gave way to the reactionary views of some who sat behind him, and introduced

uses utterly subversive of the Act of
70, which would greatly aggravate
e religious difficulty. In his opinion,
erefore, faith had not been kept
th the House of Commons. He was
nvinced that if the Bill had been intro-
ced in its present shape it never would
ve passed the House of Commons.
e entered his protest, therefore, not
ly against the action of the Govern-
ent, but also against the spirit of
gressive sectarianism which had been
troduced into the Bill, and which, he
lieved, would give rise to great agita-
on, and would ultimately end in the
struction of the denominational system.

MR. BIRLEY said, that he very much
greed with what the hon. Member for
erthyr (Mr. Richard) had said with
gard to priestly influence. While he
Mr. Birley) would be the last person to
bolish that influence entirely, it should
e kept under proper control; and if
is was not the case it was the fault of
e laity of the country. They had an
nple opportunity of taking their proper
are in the management even of de-
ominational schools, for their co-opera-
on was generally invited and welcomed
y the clergy. Indeed, the fact was, the
epartment required that there should
e more than one manager, so that a lay-
an must in almost every case be associ-
ted with a clergyman. It was a curious
act that the allegations made about vio-
tions of the rights of conscience were
lways confined to the case of Church and
oman Catholic schools, and never were
pplied to the various Nonconformist
chools. There was no such feeling in
he localities themselves, for children
reely attended the day schools of the
hurch of England where there were no
thers, and yet went to the Noncon-
ormist Sunday schools. He distinctly
hallenged the assertion that faith had
ot been kept with the House. All the
lauses which were objected to had been
arried by the whole body of the Minis-
erial side of the House, and had been
ccepted by many hon. and right hon.
entlemen opposite. He hoped that
when the Bill became law the acri-
monious views which now prevailed
would disappear, and as in his own
eighbourhood the principles of this Bill
were already acted upon with very great
success he did not see why the same
results should not be achieved else-
where.

MR. J. COWEN said, that so many speeches had been delivered on this Bill in that House during the last two months that it was all but impossible for any one now to give utterance to a new idea respecting it, or detect a new point in it. He, however, thought strongly and felt keenly on the subject, and before the Bill passed its final stage he wished to record his opinion on the measure. He might ask permission to do that more confidently, as he had not opposed the Bill in any of its stages by unnecessary talking, or by promoting uncalled-for divisions. He knew the views he held were unpopular in that Assembly, but he held them sincerely, had striven over many years to promote them, and, although only entertained by a small minority there, they had the adherence of an intelligent body amongst their countrymen outside. The noble Lord (Viscount Sandon) had on more than one occasion accused hon. Members who sat in that part of the House of inconsistency in their opposition to his measure. One section of them, he said, objected to it because it was feeble and incomplete; another censured it because it was too stringent and severe. The difference in these two charges was more apparent than real. As an educational project the Bill was weak, but as a piece of legislative mechanism for strengthening denominational schools, increasing the influence and adding to the authority of the clergy of the Church of England, it was in no sense deficient in power. The Government admitted that it was impossible to secure universality of primary instruction except by compulsion. This, coming as it did from the other side of the House, was a distinct gain. A few years ago, hon. Gentlemen opposite would not have made such a confession. But instead of putting that principle in force by the easiest, simplest, and fairest process—namely, direct compulsion, by the instrumentality of boards specially appointed for the purpose, they had devised an indirect system at once cumbersome, complicated, and complex. He certainly did not share the sentiments of hon. Gentlemen opposite as to school boards, but he was bound to say that he was not altogether surprised at their hostility to these boards. School boards had really been established in a most unhappy manner. They had been, by the action of the late Government, forced upon the country as a species of punishment. The framers of the Act of 1870 said, in effect, this—"We have no objection to sectarian schools; on the contrary we approve of them, and if the supporters of these establishments will cover the country with them, we will aid them in their work by substantial subsidies from the national Exchequer; but if the supporters of denominational schools will not do this, then we will compel them to form school boards." It was to be regretted that such opposition had been shown to these institutions, but called into existence in this way, and as a threat and a punishment, he repeated he was not astonished at the hostility they had engendered, and at hon. Gentlemen opposite attempting, now they had the power, to get quit of them. Yet he thought if their opponents would quietly and calmly review the origin and the history of school boards, they would see grounds to modify their dislike to them. These bodies came into being at a period of some political excitement, when sectarian passions were aroused and Party feeling ran high. The mode of electing their members was the worst—perhaps the very worst—that could have been devised. He did not know the motive for fixing on such a mode for electing members of school boards, but he was quite certain that the effect had been to emasculate these institutions. Through its instrumentality persons hostile to the boards had in hundreds of instances been elected members, and they had ostentatiously proclaimed it to be their intention to make the work of education by their means a failure. They had striven—sometimes, he feared, with success—to weaken the influence of the boards, and to curtail their power. They had, too, persistently exaggerated their cost, and thus attempted to rouse popular prejudice against them. The working of these boards had also been judged most unfairly. Everyone knew that no school could fairly get into good working order till it had been in existence six or seven years. It required that time to get its educational machinery adjusted. School boards had scarcely been formed six years, and few school-board schools had been fully at work three. Yet they had had repeated comparisons in that House, of the work of newly-formed board schools, with the work of sectarian schools which had been labouring from 10 to 12 or 20 years That was scarcely just. But, notwithstanding these drawbacks, in spite o their unfortunate origin, their more unfortunate mode of election, and th steady hostility and injustice that ha been shown to them, school boards wherever they had had a moderately fai trial, had produced the most gratifying results. In some places they had increased the school attendance by 60, i some by 80, and in others by 100 pe cent. This, however, was not all. Schoo boards had given in many places a new and healthy impulse to the cause of education. The formation of school board had stimulated the managers of other schools to greater exertion; and the resul had been that in some districts the whol scope of the educational machinery ha been broadened and bettered. This indirect influence for good had scarcely been second to the direct benefit that the institutions had conferred. He was bes acquainted with the North of England and he believed he could say of tha part of the country school boards ha almost universally been attended wit the most encouraging results. Whereve they had been honestly tried, they ha succeeded. He, too, was willing to bea his testimony to the fact that in th locality to which he had referred, much of the hostility felt by many member to school boards had disappeared when they had got rightly into action. When the strongest opponents met round th board table to discuss the practical details of the work of education, they gradually rubbed down the corners o each other's prejudices; and in the process of contact they all became fairer and more tolerant. He regretted deeply that the Government had consented to allow any of these useful and much-maligned institutions, even under such stringent conditions as had been agreed to, to be superseded. He was even more sorry to hear the tone and spirit in which the noble Lord and other hon. Gentlemen near him had spoken of them. Such speeches could not fail to generate and sustain a spirit of distrust towards institutions which were calculated to work a great social betterance, and which, if fostered and encouraged, would in time elevate and re-cast the whole character of English national life. Instead of forming school boards, the Government were going to use Councils in oroughs for applying compulsion. He uld not say that he had any strong jection to that proposal. Town Counls were elected by, and responsible to, e ratepayers. They were popularly ected institutions. His only objection throwing upon them educational uties was that they already had as uch work to do as they could do well. hey had already committed to them reat sanitary and municipal responsiilities; and to impose upon them other bours would, he thought, be unwise. ut if any other body except such as as specially elected for the purpose ad to control our educational agencies, e would prefer Town Councils to any xisting organizations. As the borough ouncils had to apply compulsion, he as sorry the Government had not gone urther, and committed to them all the owers of school boards. If, as well as aking compulsory bye-laws, the counils could also have had authority to uild schools where and when required, nd to superintend the work of educaon in their boroughs, his (Mr. Cowen's) bjection to the Bill would have been onsiderably modified. But while he ad no objection to municipal corporaion undertaking the supervision of chools in their respective boroughs, he ad the strongest objection to Boards of uardians doing the same work. Poor aw Guardians stood on a different ooting from members of Town Councils. Apart from the fact that the votes of opularly elected Guardians were often eutralized by the number of elective, r *ex-officio* Guardians, the application of Sturges Bourne's Act to the Poor Law ystems gave large owners of property preponderating influence in their delierations. To state the question roughly, e might say that the Guardians in too many instances represented property and ot the people. Indeed, this was what was intended by the Poor Law Amendment Act. It was openly contended at he time that measure became law that the relief of the poor was only an organized and legalized system of charity —the contribution of the rich to the support of the needy and destitute; it was only fair that the men who contributed the largest portion of this charity ought to have the greatest amount of control over its distribution; and he (Mr. Cowen) did not very well see what answer could be made to that contention. But while the system of electing Guardians might be equitable enough when the administration of the Poor Law was only to be considered, it failed entirely to meet national requirements when popular education was to be considered. Dispensing parochial relief was one thing, and regulating the education of a district was another and very different thing. The qualifications for the offices differed, and men fitted for one task might be, and often would be, altogether unfitted for the other. He was opposed on other grounds to the working people being brought too closely in contact with the administration of the Poor Law. It had a tendency to familiarize them with proceedings and practices which could not fail to depreciate their spirit of independence, and, possibly, in the end, degrade them. The less contact the mass of the people had with pauperizing agencies the better. Hon. Gentlemen on the other side spoke on this question as though the whole of England consisted of Lancashire and the agricultural districts. Indeed, nothing surprised him more in the discussions on this Bill than the ignorance which hon. Gentlemen from one part of the country had displayed concerning the habits and thoughts of the people in other parts. He could assure his hon. Friends opposite that there were other districts in Britain than those to which they were so strongly connected by material and public ties. There were "hills beyond Pentland and lands beyond Forth;" and he could say for the North-east part of England that the mass of the independent and intelligent working people there shrank from all possible contact with workhouses. Labouring men would suffer the cravings of hunger, amounting almost to starvation, rather than they would subject themselves to the humiliation, and what they not unnaturally thought the disgrace, of being compelled to seek subsistence from a parish dole. He felt that that spirit of independence ought to be sustained, and not weakened; it might seem a hard thing to say, but it was not at all clear to him that the plan followed in France of the people supporting themselve entirely and having no Poor Law to fall back upon, would not, if tried, have a tendency to increase the sense of manhood in the British agricultural labourer. Nothing to him appeared more indicative of a low state of intelligence and independence than the unblushing manner in which labourers in the agricultural districts of the Midland and Western counties would, for months together, throw themselves upon the support of the poor rate. He could assure hon. Gentlemen that such was not the practice of workmen in the part of the country from which he came; and he could not but regret that the tendency of the Bill would be to diminish that spirit of self-help. As indicating the correctness of what he said, he referred to the fact that although in the North of England they had had a prolonged period of commercial depression, the number of persons supported by the poor rate, and the amount paid for parochial relief, did not increase. If the educational machinery of the country, however, was mixed up with pauperism, the sentiment of dislike that now attached to all contact with the business of Guardians would be weakened and possibly destroyed. A further objection he had to the Guardians taking these educational duties was that the main point they considered was rates. How to keep the rates down was the "be all and end all" of the official labours of a large proportion of the members of rural Boards. This might be all well enough if viewed from a parochial or pauper point of view, but from an educational standpoint such a narrow estimate of public duties was to be deprecated. It might be quite necessary to be stringently economical in the administration of the Poor Law; but the work of national education, if it was to be pursued with advantage, ought to be administered in a spirit of generous and wise liberality such as he feared the Guardians, both by their training, and instincts, and experience, were scarcely qualified to perform. As another illustration of the curious way in which Guardians sometimes measured the duties and responsibilities of their officials, he would refer to a statement recently made at an agricultural meeting in one of the Midland counties. It would appear that several members of a Board in that district had, not in their capacity as Guardians, but as ratepayers, to appoint a schoolmaster. The man they selected for the office was postmaster, farmer, butcher, assistant-overseer, road surveyor, and organist. The object in appointing the man to all these offices was simply to save the rates by giving him many duties to perform, and thereby getting him at a lower salary. The efficiency of the teacher was not taken into account. The smallness of the salary was the only point that weighed with the Guardians in question. To show the different way in which in a large town such matters were managed, he might state that recently in Newcastle they had erected a large unsectarian school; that they had in it 1,200 scholars; and although it was simply an elementary school, they gave the head teacher £400 a-year, and paid the assistant-masters in proportion. This school, even with that liberal remuneration, was made to sustain itself without other support than was afforded by the children's pence and Government grants. Another objection he had to the Guardians was that, as a rule, the farmers and the country gentleman generally were not very warm supporters of education. He did not wish to do any class of his fellow-countrymen an injustice; but he had a strong impression that the section of the community to which he referred were in no sense enthusiastic admirers of the educational policy that was now generally approved. He could recollect the time when it was openly stated at agricultural meetings that the best workmen were the least educated. Again and again, they had heard landlords and farmers declare that when the men got too well-informed, they became dissatisfied and discontented. They sought to better their condition by either asking for additional wages, migrating to the larger towns, or emigrating to America or the colonies. Though these anti-educational principles, it was true, were not openly advocated now, they had still a lingering attraction for many. They had bubbled up in all directions from hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side during these debates. Again and again, they had had undisguised expressions of disapproval at the unnecessary time that was spent on educational matters. The direct advocacy of ignorance was not now popular. It was fashionable to support education; and in this country when anything became fashionable it always became despotic and Imperial. Persons, however, who did not openly object to education, did not hesitate to say that the smallest

ount of elementary instruction was
fficient for the working man. He had
en astonished, and pained to hear
me Gentlemen on that side of the
ouse uphold that doctrine. He en-
ely and emphatically repudiated it.
there was one body of men in
e country more than another that
quired a good education it was the
orking man. A rich man could
ford to be both ignorant and stupid.
e could pay an educated man to manage
s affairs and conduct his correspon-
ence; but a poor man had no other
pital save his intelligence. His stock-
-trade was his knowledge; and instead
attempting to reduce the standard of
lucation, he (Mr. Cowen) thought it
as their duty and interest to largely
ise it. It was a disgrace to the coun-
y, educationally considered, that the
andard was so much below what it
as in Saxony, Switzerland, America,
nd in other nations. For the grounds
at he had stated, he was opposed,
en, to the committing of any educa-
onal duties to the members of Poor
aw Unions—first, because these gen-
emen, as he had said, represented pro-
erty and not the people; second, the
ain consideration with them was the
rates," and not efficiency; and third,
at, as a body, the section of the com-
unity to which he referred was not
istinguished for their attachment to, or
dmiration for, popular instruction. He
dmitted, however, that in many places
he education would practically be
anded over, through the instrumen-
ality of school committees and their
nfluences, to the hands of the parish
arson, the squire, and a few of their
mmediate friends. But even that change
ould scarcely be beneficial. The clergy
nd the squirearchy had little, if any,
ore Liberal views on educational mat-
ers than the farmers. As a specimen
f the sort of teaching given in sectarian
chools, he would quote some remarks
ade at a meeting of Church of England
ducationists recently, at Cheetwood,
ear Manchester. On the occasion re-
erred to, Mr. Leresche, the school trea-
urer, made this significant remark,
which he (Mr. Cowen) commended to
he consideration of the noble Lord the
Vice President of the Council. In the
ourse of his speech Mr. Leresche said
it was their intention to get from the
Committee of Council on Education as much as they could, and afterwards carry out their own way as far as possible. But it was to the singular speech of another, and more influential man, that he wished to draw the attention of the House. The gentleman in question was a man of ability, energy, and high personal character—he was a near relative of the late Speaker of the House of Commons, and Vicar of East Brent. His remarks at the meeting alluded to were thus reported—

"Archdeacon Denison, in proposing cheers for the Chairman, referred to the school question, and said when the School Inspectors were inspecting the schools in Somerset some years ago, and had done all their other parishes, they said—'Now, let's toss up who goes to East Brent.' [*Laughter.*] They knew it was not a safe business. [*Renewed laughter.*] When the Inspector whose lot it was to go to East Brent arrived, he waited upon him (the Archdeacon) and told him his business. He (Archdeacon Denison) said to him—'Well, you are a big man, and not very easy to manage; but I'll tell you fairly that if you come here again, I shall lock the school door, and tell the boys to put you into the pond.' [*Great laughter.*] He went away and never came again. [*Laughter.*] Eleven years after that another Inspector went to him, and said—'Perhaps you will allow me to inspect your school.' He (Archdeacon Denison) replied that he did not like Inspectors, that he hated them—he did not wish to hate anybody, and he loved them as Christians and as men, but he hated and detested them as officials, but he told the man that he could go and inspect the school if he liked. The Inspector said he would go, and after he had been there, he (Archdeacon Denison) said to his wife—'Let's go and see what that man's doing. He's been there two hours now, and has had time to spoil the whole of the children in the school.' [*Laughter.*] They got into the school just as he was finishing, and were informed by the Inspector that he had nearly done, to which he (Archdeacon Denison) replied that he was glad to hear it. [*Laughter.*] 'Did the children ever sing?' the Inspector asked. 'Oh, yes,' Archdeacon Denison replied, and turning to his wife asked her to start them. His wife had been teaching the children to sing 'Goosey, Goosey Gander,' and after getting their voices into tune, the children struck up—

'Goosey, Goosey Gander,
  Whither do you wander,
Upstairs and downstairs,
  And in the ladies' chamber.

'Old Father Longlegs
  Didn't say his prayers,
So they took him by the left leg
  And threw him down the stairs.'

[*Laughter.*] When the Inspector heard about 'Daddy Longlegs' not saying his prayers, it had such an effect upon him that he thought it was a personal reflection on himself, and went away; and he (the Archdeacon) had never seen an Inspector, either diocesan, or any other, since, and he hoped he never would. [*Great laughter.*"]

This was the sort of education given, and the manner in which, he feared, children of the Church schools too often spent their time. They long complained of the low standard of education amongst large sections of the people; but he did not see how they could expect any higher scale of instruction, if the children's time were spent in singing such silly doggerel as this typical Church clergyman boasted he taught to the scholars in his schools. He had heard it affirmed repeatedly in that House during the last few weeks that Church of England clergymen were the most disinterested and energetic supporters of education in the country. They had been commended and complimented for their activity in this work without stint. He, however, could not assent to the unqualified praise that had been bestowed upon the parsons. He had had no inconsiderable experience in the work of popular education. Some of the pleasantest, and certainly, in a public sense, the most useful days of his life had been spent in promoting educational projects. He had been treasurer, teacher, secretary, and president of more than one Mechanics' Institution for the last 20 years, and for nearly the whole of that period he had been secretary of the Northern Union of Mechanics' Institutes; and all he could say from that rather extended experience was, that he had never found the Church of England clergy at all enthusiastic in the support of such societies, or in such education as they conferred. He had oftener found them opponents than friends, and rather antagonists than helpers. It was quite true that the Church of England clergy supported Church schools, but no other kind of schools. In the general work of education, apart from the Church, they took little interest, and in not a few instances the clergy were opposed to it. They were concerned upon no educational matter unless they were the directors, and it was under the guidance and influence of the Establishment. They used these schools too frequently, he feared, as proselytizing arenas for the Church. Of course there were exceptions, but that was his general experience. He was opposed entirely to the idea that the education of the masses was a clerical question. On the other hand it was, or ought to be, a national work and one in which the people themselves and not the parsons, should have th main direction. They were told that was absolutely essential to give religiou along with secular instruction, but h maintained that they could not teac religion in schools. They might teach dogmatic theology. Nay, they could not eve teach that. Teaching pre-supposed tha the person who learned understood wha he was taught; and it was ridiculous t suppose that children could understan their abstruse creeds, collects, and catechisms. All they could do was to compel the scholars to get these formularie off by rote, but that was not teaching He asked hon. Gentlemen if they seriousl thought it was possible to drive religion into a child of from 10 to 12 years of ag by three feet of cane, a birch-rod, or strap of leather? Religion was not system of manners, or a mere form o praise, or prayer, which evaporated with the repetition of a number of unfel words. Religion was heart-worship and its abiding principles gentleness and love; and he was satisfied that the harsh treatment and noisy surroundings o many of our schools were not calculated to encourage the growth of these kindly and generous sympathies. In our system of education, he thought many hon Gentlemen were pursuing an entirely wrong course. Instead of teaching children what to think, they should teach them how to think: they should try to improve their minds, so that they could think for themselves, rather than load their memories with the thoughts and ideas of other men. They were told that the Conscience Clause was a protection to children of Nonconformists It might be meant to be such by the Legislature, but he was perfectly satisfied that in practice it was not so in hundreds, or rather thousands, of instances. Dissenting children were made to feel a sense of social disgrace and deprivation in consequence of refusing to receive the instruction that the Church parson vouchsafed for them. To realize the force of this position, he would ask hon. Members who were such ardent believers in the efficacy of the Conscience Clause how they would like to be compelled to send their children to Unitarian schools under the protection of a Time Table Conscience Clause? If they would t be prepared to send their children to ools where Unitarian doctrines were ught and Unitarian hymns were sung, w could they, with consistency or rness, compel Unitarians to send eir children where the doctrines and mularies of the Church of England re so persistently and offensively pro- imed? He believed in time that this nding over of the education of the ople to clerical control, and mixing it with theological instruction, would abandoned, and that the work of ucation would be taken in hand by e people themselves. He would have en glad if the measure under con- leration had contributed more towards at end. But while he dissented so rongly from some parts of the measure the noble Lord, he was willing to lmit that some portions of it would be service; and he trusted that, in prac- e, the fears he entertained of other rts would not be realized. He could t conclude without expressing his nse of respectful admiration for the ble Lord for the ability with which had piloted the signally difficult Bill rough the House, and for the good mper and spirit that he had preserved nder much discussion that could not il to be both exciting and irritating.

MR. CLARE READ said, he be- eved he was in a more miserable mino- ty than the hon. Member who had st spoken (Mr. Cowen), representing, he did, what had been called "the esiduum of the stupid Party"—namely, e tenant-farmers. Like the hon. ember for Merthyr (Mr. Richard), e had one or two slight protests to ake against the Bill. He contended ot that it did not go far enough, but at in one or two instances it went too r. He considered that it imposed erious restrictions on the employment f juvenile labour—greater restrictions han the educational requirements of the ill demanded. And when hon. Mem- ers went down to their districts in the utumn and began to talk of the good which had been accomplished, some far- ers would very probably ask—"What bout educating our boys up to 14?" y keeping the age of 14 in the Bill, he eared a feeling of hostility would be reated against it in the rural districts which it would be difficult to allay. He deeply regretted, therefore, that the Go- vernment had not accepted the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Cambridge (Mr. Rodwell). The noble Lord the Vice President of the Council was compelled to go for a precedent to the Factory Act of 1874. But the subject under consideration was not a Factory Act, but the question of education. To carry out indirect compulsion, it was necessary that every inducement should be held out to secure the proper number of attendances; but the Bill would not have that effect. The noble Lord had intimated that several relaxations in favour of agriculture had been placed in the Bill at his (Mr. Read's) suggestion. But all that he (Mr. Read) had done was to strike out one of the most objectionable clauses and provide that the relaxation should come from some local authority, and not depend on the caprice of individual farmers. He had always endeavoured in the district with which he was connected to secure for the children a sound and thoroughly religious education. As a manager of voluntary schools, as a member of a Board of Guardians, and as a ratepayer he was satisfied with the Bill and grateful for it; and as a lover of justice, was glad that it secured religious freedom for the children of the poor.

MR. BURT also wished to say a few words by way of protest before the final passing of the Bill. He regretted that so much had been said in favour of giving education to the working man to make him a mere valuable money-making machine, rather than as a means of developing what was best and noblest in his nature and character, and promoting his intellectual and moral advancement. He also regretted that a considerable amount of excitement and bitterness had been imported into the discussions upon the measure, but thought that, with the exception of one or two unfortunate slips, the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Sandon) had conducted the Bill not only with great ability, but with great good temper, good sense, and good feeling. There were certain provisions of the Bill of which he most entirely approved. The provision with regard to the age at which children should be allowed to commence work was a most valuable one, as it would allow an opportunity for the foundation of a strong physical constitution for the children to be established. There might be differences of opinion as to the suitable age at which children should be employed, but after that age had been attained it was very undesirable to prevent them from being employed in a useful way, as want of employment would probably add to their ignorance the greater evils of idleness and improvidence. There was a danger to be guarded against, as had been pointed out by the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Read). He could not agree with the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen) that even town councils were suitable bodies for educational administration. Compulsion in itself was necessarily distasteful and unpopular; but if it had to be applied, it should be applied in the least objectionable way, in a direct manner, and by those in whom the people most concerned had the greatest possible confidence. He objected to the Boards of Guardians, because they were the most unpopular Bodies in this country among the classes who would be most affected by this Bill, and were regarded as the Guardians not of the Poor, but of the ratepayers; and besides, he thought it most undesirable to connect education with the administration of the Poor Law. The feeling of independence was very strong among the working classes in the North of England, and they desired most strongly to avoid coming into contact with the Boards of Guardians. Although for two years past there had been great depression in the trade of the North of England, it was a remarkable fact that there had been no appreciable increase, either in pauperism, or in the poor rates. That showed that many of the calumnies levelled against the working classes were entirely untrue, and that they were desirous of maintaining their independence. He thought that independent feeling should be encouraged and strengthened by the House, but this Bill would, he feared, have one of two effects, both of which were greatly to be deprecated—either it would weaken that feeling and familiarize the working classes with the machinery of pauperism, or it would put a stigma and a degradation upon education itself, which would make it distasteful. In reference to the alliance between the Roman Catholic Members and the Conservative Party in endeavouring to secure denominational education, he would point out to the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan), that if a similar Bill for Ireland were introduced and supported by the Conservative Party, they would then prove their consistency. It had been said that the working classes desired religious education. He had attended many meetings on this subject, and they had always declared in favour of a national system of education, founded upon a compulsory, free, and unsectarian, or in other words, secular basis. The direct representatives of the working classes on the school boards in every case with which he was acquainted were instructed to support only secular or unsectarian education; and he ventured to say that if we were to have a thoroughly national system of education it would have to be based upon the principle of being free, compulsory, and entirely unsectarian.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER asserted that the fundamental principle of the Bill was indirect compulsion. He thought the restrictions placed upon the employment of children were a mistake which would have to be remedied at some future time. The Bill would interfere very greatly, especially in agricultural districts, with free labour, and also with the most important portion of education —namely, the habit which ought at the earliest period to be inculcated on children of making themselves useful. He deprecated the raising of the Standard of education for the poorer classes as tending to render them too proud to work. Every one had felt the results of the spread of education in the difficulty of procuring domestic servants; and a friend of his who wanted to engage a housemaid, was told by one of the applicants that she could not think of taking an engagement where she could not have a room for her piano, as she must keep up her music. An hon. Member had said that in the schools religion should be taught without dogma. How was it possible, he asked, that there could be religion without dogma? No science could exist without it. Mathematics was a series of dogmas, and he pointed out that the first sentence in the "Book of Genesis" and the first sentence in the "Lord's Prayer" were both dogmas. They could not move a step in religion without dogma, and if they did away with dogma they would deprive religion of all its efficacy and all its force. There was dogma in Atheism and dogma in Deism. He contended that the most luable part of the Bill was that which couraged the teaching of religion.

VISCOUNT SANDON: There seems be a general desire that the House ould now come to a decision upon this uestion, which has occupied their at-ntion for a considerable time. I wish express generally my appreciation of e spirit in which the House has re-eived the Bill during its long and pro-acted discussions. It would be a foolish fectation on my part not to acknowledge at from some quarters there has been a een opposition to the measure, more an I had hoped from a recollection f the conduct which hon. Gentlemen owed on this side during the progress f the Bill of 1870; but still this is erhaps after all only what is to be ex-ected with regard to a Bill which ouches on a variety of difficult and dis-uted points in connection with this all-nportant subject, which affects almost very interest and feeling of every class nd community in the land. I have lways, however, tried to remember, and ave often said that, as a matter of ourse, hon. Members in Opposition ave as good a right to their opinions s the Government and its Supporters ave to theirs; and, in a great represen-ative popular Assembly like this, it vould be absurd and ridiculous to ex-ect that large measures affecting, as his one does, such a vast number of eople, opinions, and interests, could o through without considerable friction nd occasional, though, happily, not very requent, outbursts of animosity on both sides. But even allowing all this, and even after all that has passed, I still adhere to what I have said on several occasions—namely, that there is, and has been throughout, a strong and growing under-current of satisfaction and approval of the Government measure widely spread on both sides of the House. I cannot think I am wrong in this opinion, and I have a full hope, and I might almost say confidence, that this will increase into a stronger feeling, both in Parliament and in the country, when the Bill as a whole becomes more understood, and the misapprehensions and exaggerations of the hour have passed away. I cannot forget the many nights we have discussed the Bill in Committee, and the valuable suggestions received from hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House; but, at the same time, I do not pretend to shut my eyes to the keen opposition in some quarters, ever watching and endeavouring to defeat the measure by attack, or alteration, or delay, at the beginning, and going on to the end of the affair; nor can I forget the persevering and cordial support both in Parliament and throughout the country, which has enabled us, even when time began to fail, to carry the Bill through to what, I believe will be, a happy and successful conclusion. This is all past now, however, and has dropped into the historical records of *Hansard.* I will now rapidly run over the points raised in the speeches which have been made to-day, some of which have been, I venture to say, the most remarkable and interesting of the whole of these long debates. First amongst them, it is impossible not to notice the very interesting speech delivered by the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen). Looking at the opinions which we know the hon. Gentleman holds in the matter —and most properly and justly holds, just as much as we on this side are free to hold ours—it is a matter of great satisfaction to the Government to acknowledge—and the Committee will endorse what I say—that he has behaved most handsomely throughout the progress of this Bill. It is, of course, known that he is in favour of purely secular education in State-aided schools—a perfect tenable position—though one which the Government, and I believe the country, entirely disapprove of; but when once the hon. Member saw that the House and the country were clearly not with him in his views, but were generally in favour of the Government's proposals, he has never, by unduly using his influence, or by trying, as was done in some other quarters avowedly, to create delay and obstruction, to stop the progress of the Bill. But the hon. Member has to-day contributed a very interesting speech to the consideration of the whole of the subject—in fact, whenever we listen to his speeches we must feel they are worthy of all attention, as they show much real individual thought. There are two or three points in the hon. Gentleman's speech to-day which I ought to allude to. He raised the question of the cumulative vote, and said it was one of the obstacles to the success of education at the present moment; but I would remind the hon. Gentleman that the cumulative vote was added to the Bill of 1870 by a Liberal Member who now sits on the front Opposition Bench (Lord Frederick Cavendish), and was accepted by the Liberal Government of Mr. Gladstone, when the right hon. Members for Bradford and Birmingham were Members of the Cabinet; and I must add that I never heard that the Liberal Party as a body was against it, and from what passed in 1870 it appeared that many hon. Gentlemen now on the Opposition side of the House thought the introduction of that system of voting very valuable. The hon. Member has referred to the Boards of Guardians, and had raised, not unnaturally, some opposition to their being made the authority in the Bill for seeing that the children in rural districts were instructed, but he has overlooked the fact that the duties of the Boards of Guardians are very different now from what they were formerly. The Boards of Guardians are becoming very much, as I have said before, the rural municipality, and the duty of looking after pauperism is now only one part of their duty. They have become the great sanitary authority, and have jurisdiction perhaps, as a matter of fact, as far as sanitary questions are concerned, rather more over the rich, being landowners, and therefore owning many houses, than over the poor. If, at the present moment, a rich man neglects the sanitary condition of his property, he is prosecuted by the Guardians, just as is the poor man who owns and lives in a filthy hovel, and allows it to get into a state dangerous to health. I would also remind the hon. Member that this Bill largely alters the position of the Boards of Guardians, who, be it remembered, will not act directly as to these education matters from their Body, but by means of a special school attendance committee, which —just like the assessment committees chosen by the Guardians in the same way—would thus be quite separated both in name and in fact from the Poor Law administration, and would be responsible directly to the Education Department; in fact, one of the great changes introduced by Government has been to prosecute in the first instance the employer who tempts the child from his education, instead of the parent who yields to the temptation of getting the child's wages: so that, as I have said, under this Bill the position of the Guardians is again much altered, as the first duty put upon their school attendance committee under this measure is that of prosecuting the employer who breaks the law. They have therefore primarily to deal with what must be called the rich and not the poor man. They will also, of course, have to look after the negligent parent; but it can no longer be held to be a slur upon the poor parent to be thus touched by the school attendance committee of the Boards of Guardians, inasmuch as this same committee has vested in them the duty of prosecuting the rich employer if he is in fault. The hon. Gentleman says he is averse to putting education in the hands of the Boards of Guardians; and most rightly is he averse to such a scheme: but I must just ask him to recall to his recollection that this is exactly what the Government has persistently refused to do during the debates, and that we have over and over again ourselves refused to make the Guardians an educational authority like the school boards, having control over schools, and being able to build or maintain them. We showed our fixed determination specially by absolutely refusing to accept the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright), who proposed to give Town Councils and Boards of Guardians all the powers of school boards, when we insisted—and were well supported by the Committee—upon keeping the Guardians to what might be called, for convenience sake, their educational police duties. I am therefore pleased to think that the Government and the hon. Member for Newcastle are really very much at one on this question of the Boards of Guardians. Then the hon. Member has thrown out some doubts as to the clergy, or the country gentlemen, or the wealthy classes of the country being, as a body, really favourable to the education of the labouring classes. If that was the case, how is it that before 1870, when it first became a legal obligation upon every locality throughout the land, under the Education Act, to build schools for the whole of its population, if voluntary effort had not already supplied them, that I find that £8,000,000 had been spent for this purpose? Who, I want to know, spent this enormous sum? Did

e labouring class? Certainly not.
quire in every place, and you will
d that the clergy gave and procured
arge proportion. If the clergy and the
althy classes had been averse to edu-
tion they would surely not have dipped
eir hands so largely into their pockets
en there was no necessity for them to
so, and when there was no fear of
school board being placed over them if
ey did not. The hon. Gentleman says
wants to see a high standard of edu-
tion in the country. I hail him gladly
a fellow-worker in the cause—as by
neral consent we are known to have
en working zealously since we have
een in office in that direction—and I
member that the hon. Member gave
s cordial adhesion to what have been
knowledged to be the very large and
mprehensive changes Her Majesty's
overnment made in the Education Code
st year—changes the whole aim and
fect of which was to put within the
ach of the poorer classes not merely
mechanical knowledge of reading,
riting, and arithmetic, but, while it
ok greater security for the conduct,
aining, and morals of the children, and
r the needlework and domestic know-
dge of the girls, put within reach of all a
igher education in subjects, such as
istory, geography, physical geography,
otany, and mechanics, to suit the wants
f different parts of our population, if
ey choose to require such instruction,
nd laid down special rules by which all
e teaching was particularly to be
irected to developing the intelligence
f the children. I think I have shown
hat we have already actually done a
reat deal in the direction to which the
on. Member pointed, and therefore, on
his matter too, it appears that he and
he Government are to a large extent
greed. The hon. Member raises cer-
ain questions as to the supposed re-
igious difficulty, and refers to Arch-
eacon Denison, who is an admirable
an, but is generally acknowleged to
ave peculiar and extreme views, and
ould never be considered to represent
he clergy generally: and he told an
musing anecdote to show the little re-
pect the clergy had for the Inspectors
f schools. I cannot say whether the
tory is correct or not, but it is rather
hard to quote one special case against
the whole of the clergy, who have always
been anxious, independently of trying to get any special advantage to their own creeds, to open widely the Book of Knowledge to the people of the country. If the clergy generally were to treat the Inspectors of schools as Archdeacon Denison was reported to have done—and he did not at present admit that the story was correct—the Education Department would certainly have to take care and see that these gentlemen were properly respected when they went into the schools. I certainly should regret if foolish songs were taught in the schools, but we must not forget that children from 5 to 10 years of age may prefer nursery ballads to sonnets of Moore or Byron. The hon. Member spoke strongly as to the impossibility of teaching religious doctrines in the schools, and I quite agree, as I have often said, that it is not at all likely that by your religious teaching to children of the ages of 5 to 12, you will attach them to this Church or that; but a much more important object is gained: I believe, from all I know and hear, that the simple Christian teaching common to almost all Churches, as happily now given in the great mass of schools, has had a great effect on the minds and morals and future lives of the children. There was a meeting of the best teachers in the country held not long ago in London, representing various Churches, and they had prayed the Government, whatever they did, not to abolish that great instrument of religious teaching in the schools, because if that was done, they said, they would not be able to do the necessary work in the schools, and did not know how they could carry them on. I cannot leave this all-important part of the education subject without saying how much I rejoice to think, and I am sure the country and hon. Members generally will join in my feeling, that the effect of this Bill will not, in all probability, simply be to secure a sound elementary secular education for all the children of England, but that, as most of our schools are now conducted, it will secure for them the advantage of an elevating moral training, and the inestimable boon of early acquaintance with the Bible, and early Christian teaching, for those whose parents desire it. Many other interesting and valuable speeches have been made by the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Birley), the hon.

Baronet opposite (Sir George Bowyer), and others, and I appreciate very much the support which the Bill has received from such Gentlemen of experience. My hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Read) has said one or two things against the Bill which I could, perhaps, have wished unsaid; but I think that, on further consideration, my hon. Friend will feel somewhat doubtful as to whether he has been correct in his views of the Bill. My hon. Friend seems to suppose that under the Bill a child might reach 10 years of age without having had any instruction, saying that it was hard under such circumstances that a parent should not have the advantage of its labour. But the Bill provides that the local authorities, which will now exist everywhere for these purposes, should be bound to see that no parent habitually neglects his child. This is really one of the charters of the measure. My hon. Friend said he was afraid that no magistrates would convict. I would, however, remind my hon. Friend of the tremendous powers which, under a certain clause of this Bill, are provided to the Education Department in Whitehall. I think I can assure him that, whatever Government is in office, if the Department finds that the school attendance committees show any disposition not to enforce the law, steps will be taken very soon by the Education Department to send down their own officers to see that it is strictly carried out. [Mr. CLARE READ: They are not to supersede the magistrates.] Of course, they are not to supersede the magistrates; but I do not think if a Government officer brought these cases before the magistrates, that the magistrates would be so rash as to neglect a real *bonâ fide* complaint. And before leaving this point I would just beg my hon. Friend to remember that as our Inspectors constantly visit every part of the country, we shall soon know in Whitehall if the school attendance committees do their duty, and I have no doubt that managers of schools, who are largely interested in the attendance of the children, will also quickly let us know of any cases of neglect. I know, of course, and regret, that the Government and my hon. Friend are at issue in regard to 14 years being fixed as the first age of employment in extreme cases, and as the age up to which a child is liable to be seized and sent to school if an habitual idler—that is to say, "if wandering, &c.," to use the language of the Bill—being neither at work nor under instruction—even when it does possess a labour pass; but I would remind my hon. Friend that certain conditions have been attached to the age clause, at his own suggestion, respecting harvest and the necessary operations of husbandry, which are more favourable than those which previously existed. I consider it, however, of the greatest importance, as enabling the Bill to deal with the wastrel class, and as putting a greater pressure on the parents to send their children of their own accord early and regularly to school, and to give them other suitable instruction, to retain the age of 14 years. I acknowledge, however, with the greatest satisfaction the general approval which my hon. Friend gave to the Bill, and which far outweighed his not unnatural criticisms on one or two points. No hon. Member has a more thorough acquaintance with the rural districts and the feelings of the people, and the Government accepts gladly, and as high testimony, his assurance that it will be a thoroughly workable measure, a result to which he has been no slight contributor. The House has also had a very interesting speech from the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt). It is impossible not to feel that the speeches made by the hon. Member on these questions are a great addition to the discussions in the House. They have, if he will allow me to say so, an unusual freshness about them, a thorough knowledge of the subject, and they are delivered in a tone and temper which always renders them acceptable to the House. Of course, I need not say the Government does not agree with the hon. Member on many important points. There is no question about that; but we do cordially appreciate and concur in his feeling as to the desirability of securing for the working classes not only the means of rising in life, but of elevating them in the scale of mankind, so that they may be enabled to take a higher position in the general intelligence of the country, and have the advantage and pleasure of having more intellectual resources. The hon. Member spoke of the desirability of considering intellectual pursuits as a good thing themselves, and of valuing them for eir own sakes, and not looking at em merely from their money point of ew, as tending to raise one's worldly sition: this is, indeed, a noble senti- ent, such as we should expect from the on. Member, and one with which I cor- ally agree, and I hail it as represent- g what I hope may be a growing eling amongst the working classes, ith whom the hon. Member is specially ssociated. Sound sense characterizes enerally the speeches of the hon. Mem- er, and in many of the sentiments ttered by him the Government fully gree. The hon. Member is afraid hat the contact in which the Bill placed portion of the people with the Boards f Guardians might tend to diminish he independence and self-reliance of he English people. Such a result we hould particularly regret, and to avoid uch loss of reliance we have refused, mongst other reasons, to propose uni- ersal direct compulsion. I am con- dent, however, that when once the aw becomes known that children are o be educated, and that they cannot o to work under a certain age if they re not educated, the great mass of the eople, both in the towns and in the ountry, will not need any futher nterference in the matter. It is not, hen, as a rule, the ordinary respectable rtizan, mechanic, or farm labourer who will be brought in contact with the school ttendance committees of Town Councils or Boards of Guardians. Important deputations, representing large organizations of working men in town and country, have assured me that these men are full of anxiety for the instruction of their children. With the employers, firstly, these committees will have to do, and then with the negligent, the improvident, and the vicious parent. I should have been prepared to concur with the views of the hon. Member if I had entertained the slightest fear that the independence of the people, one of the most precious possessions of a nation, was likely to be affected by the measure; but I am thoroughly convinced that the Bill will only affect that class, except in special cases of vice or neglect or gross ignorance, which is now touched by the Poor Law. The hon. Member wishes that the constituencies of Town Councils and Board of Guardians should be altered, so as to admit working men on their school attendance committees; but, however desirable this may be in itself, I must, of course, pronounce no opinion upon it. I would remind him that it would have been a serious, and I may say unwarrantable, addition to the Government Bill, had they proposed also to re-model these municipal bodies. I can only say that if working men became members of the school attendance committees, I am sure they will be welcomed there by all men of sense, as they have been in the Great Council of the Nation. I have now alluded, I think, to the most important of the speeches which have been made. I do not think it would be wise nor is it necessary to enter upon the topic of religious differences which has been opened up by the speech of the hon. Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard). I regret the tone which has been adopted by the hon. Member; but it is a matter for congratulation that Government are not alone in having bitter attacks made upon them by the hon. Gentleman. If the hon. Member has said hard things of the present Government, he said still harder things in the Education Debates in 1870, as they would see on reference to *Hansard.* He then stated, I quote his words, that the Bill of 1870—of the right hon. Member for Bradford—was a measure for making the education of the people universally and for ever denominational: and he also described it as founded on the principle of concurrent endowment. As to our Bill now, he lays great stress upon the Amendments proposed to it, which he says, if all had been accepted, would have made the Bill horrible; but I must really beg him to remember that we accepted principally Amendments, and important ones too, from his own side, and refused whole sheets of Amendments from hon. Members sitting near us. As to his saying that the present Bill was the worst and most tyrannical measure since the reign of Queen Anne, I will leave the justice of that statement to the sense of Parliament and the community outside. I have had communication with many leading members of the Nonconformist Churches, and am assured by many of them that that is not at all the way in which they look upon the measure. As to the expressions of the hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), that the Government has broken faith in this matter, by accepting Amendments which reversed the policy of the Act of 1870. I confess I am astonished at such a statement, but it appears to be merely an assertion, and based upon no facts, so I confidently leave it to the judgment of Parliament. I must, however, recall to the hon. Member's recollection—though, perhaps, as till the struggles of the last few days he took little apparent interest in our discussions, he may therefore be unaware of what passed—that in introducing the measure I particularly invited suggestions from both sides of the House, which I intimated we should gladly accept if we considered them improvements, and not inconsistent with the principle of the Bill; and when, on going into Committee, I mentioned some leading changes in the early clauses, resulting from the previous discussions, I closed my remarks by stating in so many words that I must not thereby be held to be precluded from proposing or from accepting from any quarter any other Amendments, and this reservation was specially cheered, in token of assent as I understood, by hon. Gentlemen opposite, and the Paper was at that time crowded by Amendments. As a matter of fact, we have only accepted two Amendments at all affecting the Bill of 1870, and surely after six years' experience we may well be allowed to remedy proved defects—the first, to allow localities to get rid of unnecessary school boards, now that another existing authority is entrstued with full powers to do their work; and the second, to do for England what the Scotch Education Bill of 1872, which was passed by the last Liberal Government, did for Scotland—namely, to confide the payment of fees for poor children to the Poor Law authorities instead of to the school board. I do not allude to the repeal of the famous 25th clause, as that repeal we accepted from the Liberal Party, on the Motion of the right hon. Member for Bradford. The whole school-board system is, in fact, kept intact, and the country has the free choice of which it prefers, unless it neglects to supply schools, when it must have school boards. It is really a perfectly untenable position to call these changes a reversal of the Act of 1870. So much, then, for the speeches which have been delivered to-day. The real opposition to the Bill has been based, the Committee will see, on considerations upon leading points which were fully discussed in 1870, and which were pressed by the extreme section of the Liberal Party upon their Government—namely, universal school boards, universal compulsion, and the extinction of voluntary schools. General free education was also discussed in 1870, and pressed from the same quarter; but all these schemes were steadily opposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone), and by the bulk of the Liberal Party, and were rejected by the decisive feeling of the House, even when the Conservatives were only a small minority, so that to press these matters now, which are the special points of the Birmingham Education League, after the country, both at the General Election and at the mass of school-board elections, has decided against that League, had been surely a waste of time. The truth is that hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite are always forgetting that by the announcements of the right hon. Member Bradford, and of the then Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone), the Education Bill of 1870 was intended to fill up gaps in the voluntary education system of the country, and to do the best to keep those schools alive. They, it is true, seemed to hope that, by what they called a process of painless extinction, the great body of voluntary schools would be destroyed; but this, they must remember, was always denied by the Liberal Government, the authors of the Bill. Upon these assurances of theirs the Bill was accepted by the country and assisted by the Conservative Party in Parliament. I cannot allow them to forget, if they have any further doubts as to my being right, what in one of the leading debates was said by the then Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone), when he proposed to substitute an increased Government grant for the local aid from rates to the voluntary schools, that that increased grant would, he believed, enable the voluntary schools to stand in competition with the schools for which rates were to be levied by the new school boards under the Bill. This is the very provision which we say, owing to the increased cost of schools under the Act, has not been carried out, and which we seek to set right by our increased Government grant, which has also many her educational advantages. Surely this speech of the late Prime Minister's, and the Amendment which he then introduced, confirms decisively what I have said, and puts beyond the reach of dispute that the Liberal Government, representing an overwhelming Liberal majority, intended and assured the country by word and act in 1870 to maintain the voluntary schools. After the endless discussions in Committee, it is, perhaps, difficult to recollect how the Bill now stands. I will, therefore, so to speak, take stock of what has passed, and will give a rapid sketch of the measure as it leaves this House. The Bill was introduced by the Government on the assumption, which the debates have completely confirmed, that the country wished that there should be universal education for the people. We have, therefore, headed the Bill by a declaration that it should be considered henceforward the legal duty of the parent to provide elementary instruction for his child. We have not, however, adopted the scheme of universal direct compulsion, with its array of rules, attendance officers, and expenditure; but we have gone upon the supposition that, with respect to the great majority of parents, if you remove the great temptation of his child's earnings by punishing the employer who employs the child under the legal age, and without the certificate of sufficient schooling, they will, both from the usual wish to comply with a law when it is once passed, and from real regard for the child's welfare, get their children properly instructed. We consider it a matter of the highest importance for the people, as affecting the national character, its independence, its self-reliance, and the sacred principles of freedom, that the people should not be told by the State that so many hours a day, for so many weeks in the year, they should send their children to school. The case is of course quite different when a locality by popular vote, and under the guidance of a school board of its own electing, chooses to have the rules, &c., of direct compulsion. This, under this Bill, they can do just as before. But now comes the second stage of the measure, if the parents do not, in their own interests and those of their children, send the latter to school, or get them properly instructed, the Government has held that these parents come into a different category: they have shown themselves unfit for the precious charge of their child; so then, in the interests of the child's future life, and in the interests of the country of which he must become a citizen, we say that the State has a full right to intervene, and we then have no hesitation to apply direct compulsion, and we charge the local authority to lay down compulsory rules for the child's education, which the parent has shown himself unfit to manage. I have thus given in short the principle upon which we have built up our measure. I do not expect to see any sudden educational revolution created within the next 12 months by this measure, and should feel some alarm if such was the result. We are dealing, by the hypothesis, with a class of people who are unwilling to send their children to school, and if a sudden revolution in their family habits were brought about amongst this class, it would set them against the Bill, and do more to set them against education than any legislation could do in the other direction. I think, therefore, a very important provision of the Bill is that by which it only comes into operation very gradually by a sliding scale of five years. This will greatly relieve the strain of the new law upon the parents, the children, and the employers of labour. The Bill, then, after the declaration of the parent's duty, goes on to say that no children should be employed under 10 years of age, and by so doing we put on an equality all trades and occupations throughout the country, and I am confident that this will be a great gain to the parents and the employers. The next step is to fine employers who break the law; and then we provide that at 10 years of age a child to be employed shall have a certificate, either that he has passed a certain Standard of knowledge, or that he has completed five years' previous attendance at an efficient school, or, which is the "honour certificate," that he has passed a higher Standard than the necessary one, having also regularly attended an efficient school. Those certificates are thus of three kinds, and form a most important part of the Bill. You have the dunce's pass, the ordinary pass and the honour pass, and the last-named will, I hope and believe, give a keen stimulus to the work of education in many districts. This is, I know, a new plan, but it is surely worth a trial. It is like a prize in the school for the children most remarkable for attainments and character—however poor they may be—and is, in fact, an exhibition founded by the State; but the trifling money advantage is its least important part. So far our legislation by compulsion, &c., has been all confined to driving the children to school: on this, in my opinion, we ought not in fairness only to base our legislation. I have a good confidence that the honour certificate will not only do much more to secure regular attendance at school, but that it will do a still more valuable work—it will awaken a keen sense of honour and ambition, and the invigorating feeling of distinction, in many an out-of-the-way place in the country, as well as in many a back court in our towns, and will lay the foundation for the honourable success of many a child in after life. The next point is that which has reference to children between the ages of 10 and 14. The Bill here deals with "wandering" children, and provides that where a child is habitually not at work and is found wandering, even if he has got a labour pass, he is bound to be sent to school by the local authority, unless there is a reasonable excuse. This is a most important principle in the Bill — that a child up to 14 years of age shall not be idle even after he has got the "labour pass." All wastrel children, so to speak, will be looked after by this Bill. Then the important clause having reference to day industrial schools comes in as a supplement to the action of the Government respecting wastrel children in our towns. This provision is now surely shorn of all possible danger of abuse, and I entreat the House to give their cordial support to that which is after all avowedly only an experiment. It is forced upon us by the existence of an enormous evil never yet dealt with—that is to say, the particular class of children who haunt our big towns: the wretched children who throng the worst parts of our cities. These are the children who, if they are girls, grow up to be the miserable women whom we pass with loathing in our back streets, and who are the depair of our workhouses, and, if boys, they became that peculiar, stunted, degraded class which prowls about our worst alleys, which emerge into light only at moments of popular disturbance, and which make a constant home of our gaols. These poor children become the disgrace of our Christianity and civilization, and grow up to prey upon society. Ask the school boards in the big cities: they will tell you they elude their grasp, and, unfortunately, the ragged schools, which alone effectively dealt with them, have been much diminished, unintentionally, by the Act of 1870, and thus these are the very children for whose education the intervention of law is most needed. I earnestly hope, therefore, that Parliament will help the Government in the attempt—I confess it a difficult one—to cope with one of the most terrible evils of our civilization. The Bill then proceeds to provide for the payment of school fees by Boards of Guardians, when necessary in cases of great poverty, as in Scotland under the Act of 1872; and then it removes that great bone of contention, the 25th clause of the Act of 1870. The removal of this clause was not owing to one side of the House, nor to either political Party, but was owing to the spirit of conciliation which happily influenced many hon. Members on both sides of Parliament, who felt primarily and very strongly for the cause of education. The measure provides that existing local authorities everywhere in boroughs and towns in the country shall appoint school attendance committees; at the beginning of next year, therefore, they will have, in every part of the country, a new authority to look after the education of all the children. The erection of the existing local authorities into school education authorities, as far as seeing that all children get due instruction is concerned, is a most important point, it not only will effect a great saving of expense and prevent the Party bitterness which must follow from frequent elections, in opposition to the scheme of creating new boards everywhere for this purpose, but it has the immense advantage, as all must feel who look at it broadly, and not from a Party platform, in a political point of view, as it tends to concentrate duties in the hands of the existing local authorities, to increase its dignity and weight, and by giving it fresh duties of interest to attract the best people to enter its ranks. Beyond this, these school attendance committees may appoint little local committees out-

e their own bodies, in every village,
aid them in their work. As there
s been some misapprehension as to
ool boards, I must add that school
ards will be appointed as heretofore
the Department where a place does
make a sufficient supply of schools,
d it is also left optional to every part
the country to have school boards if
ey desire them; further, where there
a school board, but no school, if two-
rds of the people desire to get rid of
and the board is not required in
opinion of the Education Depart-
nt for the purpose of education, a
jority of the ratepayers can do so. I
ould be truly sorry to have it thought,
one moment, that by having accepted
is provision, that the Government
eant to weaken the authority of the
hool boards. On the contrary, as long
the present Lord President and my-
lf are at the office, I can assure the
ommittee they will have the firm sup-
rt of the Department—as they have
d hitherto—as long as they do their
ty. This very Bill itself ought to
ow the country that the Government
ishes rather to increase the efficiency of
hool boards in their difficult education
bours. These changes have been little
oticed on this head, but look at its
rovisions; independently of the great
sistance given to school boards as to
hool attendance by the new general
direct compulsion of the Bill, there
e many other special provisions for
eir benefit. All the heavy expense
nd inconvenience of bye-elections is
one away with—a great boon to large
owns—and they are enabled to fill up,
s in Scotland, their own bye-vacancies.
hen, it is now provided that they
an build offices for themselves: a
atter the large places were very anxious
or on the ground of expense and conve-
ience. Further, they are to be allowed
o raise money by loan for this purpose
nd for building industrial schools; and
ast, though not least, we have removed
rom them that great source of bitter-
ess, the 25th section of the Act of 1870.
ll this surely shows a desire to facili-
ate the work of school boards. I hope
rom this survey of the Bill, the House
vill feel with me that a great advance
as been made—a great advance, I
nean, towards securing the sound edu-
ation of the whole of our people; but
when I use the word advance I must
guard myself against being supposed, in accordance with expressions I have heard used, to mean that it would be an advance in our course to adopt general direct compulsion. If we are driven to this at last, it would be an acknowledgment of national weakness, by the failure of this or other schemes, which I, for one, do not at all expect. I should hold that to be obliged to confess that parents were not able to do their duty to their children without the daily intervention of the State, and that to be driven thus to direct compulsion would be anything but an advance: and I trust, and cannot but believe, that hon. Members on both sides will agree with me that if they can do without direct compulsion it will be a subject for rejoicing. I claim then for the Government and for myself that we have kept steadily in view in this matter the real advantage of the children. We have throughout taken this as our guiding star. This being once secured, we have endeavoured to interfere as little as possible with the industry of the country, and to avoid the fatal mistake of throwing discredit upon the labour of the hand or of discouraging the habits of work, and we have also kept constantly in mind that it was all-important in the interests of education itself and of the national character to interfere as little as possible with the personal freedom of the people, to incur as little unnecessary expense as possible in carrying out the operations of the law, and to utilize every existing institution. So far as I am concerned, now that the Bill is about to pass through this House to "another place," I can only say that I shall endeavour to forget all the opposition the measure has received, and I shall try only to bear in mind the unexpected support which it has received from all quarters of the House. I desire now to express my warm acknowledgments of that support, most kind and cordial, which I have received in my difficult task. The recollection of the attacks made upon us will soon pass away, but not so the remembrance of the kind and valuable assistance we have obtained. In conclusion, then, I will venture to express the honest hope and expectation, in which I believe most hon. Members will join me, that, whatever have been their opinions in the past, whatever may be their political or ecclesiastical opinions, they will do their

best, each in his own district, to make the measure work as efficiently as possible, so as to give effect to the earnest desire of the Government, of Parliament, and of the nation, so as to place our social system on broad and deep foundations, by securing the general sound instruction of the whole of our people, and thereby fitting them to be worthy subjects and useful citizens of the great State of England.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, that when the Speaker put the Question from the Chair, and proposed that the Bill should be read a third time, and challenged hon. Members to a division, a great many of them would have to consider what course they would have to take under the circumstances. Hon. Members would agree that it was a grave question for many of them to say whether, after these protracted debates, they found themselves in a position to vote for the third reading of this Bill, or whether they would be compelled to vote against it. The noble Lord opposite (Viscount Sandon) had placed before them the condition in which the Bill would leave the House if it were passed. In two sentences he (Mr. Goschen) would state two of the results which would occur to many Members on that (the Opposition) side of the House. School boards had suffered in reputation and power. The 25th clause of the Act of 1870 had been repealed, but a worse clause had been substituted. School boards had suffered in consequence of the position which the noble Lord and the Party opposite had taken up. The authority of the boards would be weakened in the country, and the legislation of 1870 had been represented in a different light from that in which it was conceived and executed. They would further find themselves in this position—that while the noble Lord said the 25th clause was a bone of contention and had been removed, an arrangement had been substituted in its place which would cause as much contention and as much heart-burning, and would be universal, extending over a wider area than the clause of which it took the place. Under these circumstances, what course ought those of them who felt strongly on this point to pursue? He would only speak for himself, but he believed he should be speaking the sentiments of a great many on that side of the House when he said that throughout the whole of the discussions on the Bill their opinions, and their political consciences, he might almost say, had been stretched to the utmost. Many of them felt that the 25th clause had left a grievance in the minds of a large portion of the community. Many thought that any Bill that did not, to a certain extent, remedy the grievance under which the Dissenters thought they were labouring would not be a satisfactory measure. But so anxious were they to support the Government, in the interests of the people, that through many stages of the Bill they did not oppose it, but voted in favour of it. On the second reading, and in Committee, even at last, when the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) had proposed his clause, which was received with so much dissatisfaction on that side of the House, they supported the Government. On the Report they only made a protest, and throughout they had shown an interest in the educational part of the measure, and were most reluctant to take any step hostile to the Bill. But, subsequent to that protest, and notwithstanding the proof of conciliation on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, on the Report a blow was struck at the Nonconformists, strengthening denominational schools, and against, he would not say the prejudices of some hon. Gentlemen, or their wishes, but their just claims. He asked, whether it was a fair mode of dealing with the House that on the Report, at the end of the Session, when it was impossible to communicate with all classes of the country and give the country an opportunity of pronouncing on such a thing as this, that a radical change should be made in the character of the Bill? The noble Lord minimized the effect of the Bill, but hon. Members knew it would have a great effect. With regard to the repeal of the 25th clause, the Government were putting an end to the dispute by the force of its large majority. It could not be said that it was a removal of the bone of contention. If it was removed from the area of the school board, it was not removed from the area of the ratepayers or the public or those interested in education. That being their position, what was it their duty to do in the present crisis? He saw no other course open to them than this—that if there should be division, they should record their es against the third reading. He ew that that vote would be misinter ted, but he thought he might appeal the action of the Party, and to what noble Lord opposite himself had d—namely, that they had been most xious to promote the cause of educa n, to show that, unless under great ovocation, they would not have op sed the measure. He did not want to e against the Bill as a matter of form, t he thought that it would be better the interests of education that the ll should not pass at all than that it ould become law containing those ovisions which had been recently in duced into it. Moreover, if the result ould be to throw out this Bill, another ght be introduced next Session, and en the question of the denominational stem could be more fully canvassed. e noble Lord had said that the Bill ould not aggravate the religious diffi lty, but that pledge had been broken, cause the measure aggravated the fficulty in a manner that would set a rge portion of the people of the untry against the scheme. He thought a misfortune that the question should ve produced so much acrimony, and did not think the cause of education ould lose if the Bill was not read a ird time. No hon. Member had ntured to answer the question which as put to the Government the other y—namely, if they had Unitarian hools, with a Conscience Clause, would ey compel children of the Church of ngland to go into them? That was a allenge which had never been taken . He believed that in the long run pular feeling would declare itself gainst the compulsory attendance of ildren at denominational schools, and e support of such schools by public oney. Personally, if a division were allenged, he had no option but to vote gainst the Bill.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that as e differed somewhat from his right hon. riend who had just sat down (Mr. oschen), and as probably there would e a division, he thought it absolutely ecessary that he should explain what ourse he intended to take. It would e very kind of the House to listen to im, as he was now speaking his own ersonal views in the matter, and giving hat was almost approaching a personal explanation. Now, he naturally looked very much to educational results; but he did not agree with some hon. Gentlemen that if the opponents of the measure had succeeded in preventing its passing that it would be absolutely necessary to re-introduce it next year. Indeed, he thought it would have been possible for the Government to have gone on for some time without any fresh measure. He agreed with the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Sandon) in much that he had said as to the educational results of the Bill. Those results were to him of the greatest importance. First of all, they had got this result, that work was stopped under 10 years of age. That was a very great result. Then they had the principle established that after 10 and up to the age of 14 the children must attain a certain Standard, or work and school went on together. He considered that another great result. [An hon. MEMBER: Not in agricultural districts.] He thought his hon. Friend was mistaken there. By the Amendment of his noble Friend the Member for the West Riding (Lord Frederick Cavendish), on the second reading, the principle was established that no child could work full-time after 10, and before the age of 14, unless it had attained a certain Standard of efficiency, or had made a certain number of attendances, failing which it would be put upon half time, or work and school together. His hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) thought they had gone too far in enlarging the half-time age from 13 to 14. He, however, regarded that as a great advantage; and there was another—an advantage the effects of which it was not very easy to overlook—that workshops had been placed under the same educational provisions as factories. But these were not the only good educational results obtained by the Bill. These results referred to indirect compulsion; but the Bill had been so improved that it was now, in his opinion, a measure of direct compulsion. Upon this point he thought there had been some misconception. The noble Lord opposite (Viscount Sandon) had always interpreted direct compulsion in a way that he (Mr. Forster) did not. He seemed to think that in order to establish direct compulsion, it should be ordered that every parent should be made to send his child to school for certain hours every day.

That was not, as he understood it, what they were aiming at. What they were aiming at was, that by the law of the land a parent should be bound to provide for the education of his child, and that if he neglected to do so, some authority should cause it to be done for him, and the parent should be subjected to a penalty. That was what he considered to be direct universal compulsion, and that was what was enacted by this Bill. Parliament was bound, first of all, to declare by Act of Parliament what was the duty of a parent, and accordingly it said, by the 4th clause, that it was the legal duty of a parent to see that his child was taught, as well as fed and clothed; and in the 8th clause—originally the 7th, as now amended—it told the local authorities throughout the country that if any parent habitually neglected to perform his duty in regard to the education of his child he was to be made to do it. To his mind the educational results of these provisions were very important, and he should be sorry to learn that the country disapproved of them. The hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) was really to be congratulated, for almost every one of the recommendations which he urged in his Motion upon the second reading had been adopted, or rather complied with, inasmuch as the Bill had been made to accord almost entirely with the suggestions of the Factory Commission. Leaving the educational results for a moment, he came to the other features of the Bill. His right hon. Friend (Mr. Goschen) considered himself compelled by the alteration which had been made in respect to the 25th clause to vote against the third reading. It was, however, possible to overrate the change which had been made. Still, he exceedingly regretted that the Government had allowed the subject to be mooted, and he entirely agreed with his right hon. Friend as to the mode in which the change had been made—a change which had been brought forward with so little Notice, and to which the Government themselves had become reconciled in so brief a time. But that was merely the way in which the result had been arrived at. And what was the result? Those who were opposed to the change evidently thought that in the transfer of duties the Boards of Guardians would inherit the whole of the difficulties of the school boards, and would be put in a new position. That would not be the case; for at the present moment the Boards of Guardians experienced and were meeting those difficulties, and they heard nothing about any particular inconvenience arising. At that moment every Board of Guardians throughout the country was required by the Act of 1873 to perform the same duty as the parochial boards of Scotland—that was to pay the school fees of out-door paupers, under regulations similar to those of the 25th clause. The enormous majority of the children who were neglected and for whom payments would have to be made were the children of the out-door paupers; and what was proposed now was merely that the children of the comparatively few parents who were too poor to pay fees, but who were not paupers, and with regard to whom the school boards had at present the option of paying or not paying the fees, should be put, as in Scotland, under the same superintendence as those who were paupers. They were, in his opinion, doing a great thing in relieving the school boards of this difficulty. The school boards themselves, in his opinion, would think it no slur that it had been taken away from them. The London School Board, he was informed a little while ago, had petitioned the Department to get rid of it. He was sure of this—that under the change there would be an immense diminution in the amount of school fees that would be paid; for this reason—the Boards of Guardians had both more knowledge of the inability of payment on the part of the parents and more wish to take care of the rates than a school board—they were more economical, and better knew who were too poor to pay and who were not. He did not know whether Boards of Guardians were denominational or not; but he did know that a large number of school boards were not secular. He was perfectly sure that in those places in which the school boards had made the most payments under the 25th clause—in Manchester, Salford, and Liverpool—the practical effect would be that the denominational schools would receive far less help out of the rates than they hitherto had received. He could not, therefore, make this change a ground for voting against the third reading of the Bill, much as

regretted the mode by which this re-
t had been arrived at. Having al-
ys held that the parent had a right
choose the school to which he would
ıd his children, the change did not,
course, weigh much with him. He
.s perfectly well aware that he might
charged now, as indeed he had been
arged before, with inconsistency to
s extent—that in places where there
.s only one school the parents would
ve no option. In such a case, he
uld have to choose between the child
d the parent, and it being so neces-
ry that the child should be educated,
should decide that the child should
sent to the school that did exist. It
d been asked of the supporters of the
ll how they would like to be com-
lled to send their children to school if
ly Unitarian schools existed. Well,
ere were many situations in which
conveniences and difficulties arose, but
ey might depend upon it the establish-
ent of mere unsectarian or secular
ools would not get rid of this parti-
lar difficulty. For instance, they would
ve to deal with the Roman Catholic
rents, and with other parents of strong
ligious views, who certainly would not
e to have their children compelled to
tend secular schools. They might say
at was a most unreasonable prejudice;
it they would nevertheless find that
e same difficulties and inconveniences
ould arise much as at present. Con-
dering, therefore, the educational re-
lts of the Bill, especially as amended
Committee, he could not, on account
the change with regard to the 25th
ause, vote against it. But he had now
consider the two clauses which had
en introduced into the Bill, and to
hich, as the House was aware, he was
ongly opposed. He had very little
ubt that the clause for the dissolution
school boards would not have much
actical effect. Never was the House
Commons occupied so long a time
on so small a matter. ["Hear, hear!"
om the Ministerial Benches.] Hon.
embers on the other side cheered that
atement; but if they felt the reason
it they should not have pressed so
nall a matter so strongly. Some of
em on that side of the House did their
st to minimize the effects of the clause,
ıd they did so fritter it down that it
me now to very little. It was wonderful how quickly the animus that cropped up in the heat of debate passed away, and was forgotten; and coming to the third reading, it was not sufficient for them to say that they disliked the hard speeches made and the animus displayed; but they must consider the actual measure itself. The other clause was a very important one, and one which obliged him not to record his vote at all—he referred to the relaxation of the restrictions with regard to the Parliamentary grants. He could not put himself in the position of being supposed, by voting for the third reading of the Bill, to assent to this alteration. He regarded it as a most important change of principle, and although its immediate effects might be slight its ultimate effects would be great. He believed further that those ultimate effects would be exactly opposite to those intended by the promoters; for denominational schools, supported without subscriptions, if they did not become State schools, would become much subjected to State control. Now, as to the effect which this Bill might be supposed to have upon the condition of things as they were left by the Act of 1870, he thought the Government had acted most unwisely in disturbing the settlement of 1870, and he must be allowed to say that, in consequence of these changes, the alteration in the Parliamentary grant, and the dissolution of school boards, he did not consider himself any longer bound by any engagement he might have been supposed to enter into at the passing of the Act of 1870. He hoped, however, that his Friends on this side of the House would not misunderstand him. In regard to the Act of 1870 he had been in this pleasant position—that he had never felt himself compelled by expediency or for the purpose of getting the Bill passed to do anything that he did not consider fair and just, and in the true interests of education. What, therefore, he wished to state was simply this—that he should now consider himself perfectly free to adopt in this important matter of education, under any changed circumstances of the country, whatever course he thought most conducive to the interests of the children and of the country generally, though he must be allowed to say that he was still of opinion that

the Act of 1870 had been framed upon fair and just principles.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 119; Noes 46: Majority 73.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

EGYPT—MR. CAVE'S MISSION—EGYPTIAN FINANCE.—RESOLUTION.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL rose to call attention to Mr. Cave's Mission to Egypt, and to move,

> "That it is inexpedient that the British Government should take any part to facilitate loan transactions to the Khedive of Egypt."

He said that the Motion was now somewhat out of date, because the evils which it was intended to guard against had not come off in a direct form. He had kept the Motion on the Paper to bring it forward that day, rather with the view of giving the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham an opportunity of giving some information to the House on his important Mission, than with any other object. The Session bade fair to end as it began, with discussions regarding the Suez Canal and the affairs of Egypt. He would not refer to the Suez Canal, except to say it was evident that the great and glorious results which the Press and the public seemed to anticipate from that purchase had not been realized. He was bound to say also that the evils, the risk of which had been incurred had not so far developed themselves, but that, as often happened in such cases, neither the good nor the evil was so great as had been anticipated. He would confine his observations to the Mission of the right hon. Gentleman and the state of Egyptian finances, of which his Report was the subject. At one time there was very great reason to fear that Her Majesty's Government might meddle with the finances of Egypt, and he, for one, thought it undesirable and inexpedient to do so; but he was very glad to find that the intention of Her Majesty's Government to appoint a Commission to deal with the Egyptian Debt had not been carried out. The general feeling of the country, if he (Sir George Campbell) apprehended it rightly, was that too large a political character had been given to the right hon. Gentleman's Mission, and that too large a staff accompanied him to do what might very well have been done by a clever and experienced financial clerk. He went to ascertain the exact state of the finances of Egypt, and not to produce any great political or financial effect upon that country. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take the opportunity of giving the House some information with regard to the Report which had been presented to Parliament, and especially in regard to the sources of the information contained in the Report, and to the state of the Egyptian Revenue, especially the effect of the imposition of the Moukabala and the probable effect of the cessation of the Moukabala. He should be glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman justify his sanguine view of Egyptian finances, and to know that the reports of these finances were founded on clear and undoubted evidence. Until he (Sir George Campbell) heard full explanations on those points he must continue to regard the right hon. Gentleman's Report as too sanguine. If it should prove that the right hon. Gentleman had been too sanguine, that would be, he apprehended, a great evil, because the result had been to bolster up unduly the credit of Egypt—a result which the Khedive, a shrewd and sagacious man, no doubt desired. At first the Khedive did not like the Mission, but finding it was inevitable he determined to utilize it to the utmost for the benefit of Egyptian credit, to supply it with facts of a sanguine and roseate hue, and thus to favour a financial scheme, which, if it had succeeded, would have induced the people of these countries to lend their moneys. He (Sir George Campbell) was glad that scheme for the conversion of the Egyptian Debt had not succeeded; for he was very apprehensive that if it had succeeded, all the people who lent their money would have said, and said with some justice, that they were induced to do so by the Report of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham. He had expressed in the Resolution on the Paper, that it was

tter they should not interfere to try and
tch up Egyptian finance, for he did
t believe in patching up the finances
foreign countries for the benefit of
widow, and the orphan, and the poor
rgyman, and the half-pay officer. He
s aware that it was argued that for
benefit of the poor people who held
se old Egyptian loans, these foreign
ns should be patched up. He pitied
se poor people very much; but if we
re to adopt this mode of assisting
m, a great many other people might
ilarly get into difficulties. He be-
ved the first loss was the best, and
at it was not wise to prop up the
dit of any foreign State that might
in a rotten or tottering condition.
e thought, too, that the very sanguine
ports of the Revenues of Egypt
uld lead to great harm; and it might
d the Khedive to think it necessary to
stify the estimate by screwing more
ney out of those under his control.
e found that the land revenue of Egypt
as already ten times the highest revenue
hich we obtained from the people of
dia. It was above the average rent
r acre of the land of England, and, if
lditional taxation was imposed upon
e down-trodden cultivators of Egypt,
e result would be one we should not
justified in aiding and abetting. He
und from the figures that the land
venue of Egypt was £4,300,000, and
at on account of the operation of what
as called the Moukabala that revenue
d been reduced by about £1,600,000.
e also found that about £1,500,000 of
e Moukabala had been treated as an
sset, whereas it was in reality only a
pitalization of the Revenue. There
ould be, according to his figures, a loss
£3,200,000 of the revenue on ac-
unt of the cessation of the Moukabala.
e wanted to know where these figures
me from, and on what it was that the
ght hon. Gentleman based his sanguine
stimate of the finances of Egypt on the
ssation of the Moukabala payments?
f a new land tax was, as he gathered,
be imposed in substitution for the
oukabala, great injustice was likely to
e done. He would be glad if the right
on. Member for Shoreham removed
at impression. There were other
ems of revenue of which he should
ke explanations. In other parts of
urope an octroi was supposed to be a
cal tax which could not legitimately be
taken as a source of general revenue, and if the estimate of the net profit of the Egyptian railways was correct, they must be the most profitable railways in the world. He had the greatest doubts of the possibility of, and therefore of the expediency of attempting to, veneer these old Oriental Governments with the gloss of modern civilization. They had a strength and vigour of their own; but his experience was that the result of any attempt to civilize and modernize them was to destroy their old vitality without imparting a new one. This was more specially the case when you put them into the hands of City financiers and tried to vitalize them with money from the City; there could not be a more speedy, more effectual road to ruin for these States than their putting themselves into the hands of persons in the City. Whereas the Predecessors of the Khedive had executed considerable works of public importance, and yet had incurred only a small Debt, the impression derived from the Papers was that the Khedive had incurred large debts and done little work with the money. We had not only aided him in great financial schemes and industrial enterprizes, but our money had also aided and abetted him in great political projects. He was an exceedingly ambitious man, and he had conceived the project of establishing a great Empire in Africa, which he thought would be better in the hands of still more civilized Powers. As the result of the loan from this country, he had established a large Army, which had not only been employed for great conquest or attempted conquest in Abyssinia, but 15,000 or 20,000 black troops in Egypt had been sent to assist in crushing the Christians of Turkey, a course of proceeding which to him (Sir George Campbell) seemed to be a serious thing to be done with the money of this country. Further, a Mahomedan Power must be a very great difficulty in the way of our efforts to put down the Slave Trade, and the evidence was strong that in the Red Sea, under the Turkish and Egyptian flags, a very large slave trade was carried on. Considering the doubtful character of the enterprizes which the Ruler of Egypt undertook, at all events, there was every reason why at present the Rulers of this country should not bolster up the credit of the Potentate of Egypt; that he should settle as best he

could with the financiers with whom he might deal, without being patted on the back in official Reports to our own Government, or having his credit bolstered up by any other indirect means. Having made these observations, perhaps he would best consult the opinion of the House by not moving his Resolution, and by simply calling his attention to the subject, in the hope that he would elicit some statement from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham.

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE, who was received with cheers, said: I rise in accordance with the hon. Member's invitation, and because I imagine the House will expect me to say a few words before the Session closes; otherwise I should much prefer remaining silent. I agree with him that his Motion is now somewhat out of date. I feel that the interest which formerly attached to my Mission has well nigh died away, and that the affairs of Egypt have naturally been thrown into the shade by more urgent and important events in the East. I should not, therefore, be justified in repeating what is said in my Report, or detaining the House over the varying fortunes of the Egyptian Mission. My Report has long been before the country. All that we said and did in Egypt, and a good deal more, has been duly chronicled and commented upon. Still less is it my business to defend the policy of sending the Mission to Cairo. That will be done by others. But whatever differences of opinion there may have been in England on that point, I believe there was little doubt in other countries. I believe, moreover, that without it—without the exposure of the perilous state of the finances of Egypt which resulted from our inquiries—her Ruler would, like so many others in similar difficulties, have gone on shutting his eyes to the danger of the course he was pursuing, and the end would have been more hopelessly disastrous than the present crisis. The hon. Member charges me with unduly bolstering up the credit of Egypt. That may be his opinion, but that was not the opinion of the Khedive. He complained that the Mission, far from assisting him to borrow, closed the Money Market against him; and, if that were so, it may turn out that this was the best thing that could have happened, though his difficulties may have been aggravated at the time. No doubt, such a Mission to an independent Power was perhaps unprecedented, and it was a very delicate and difficult duty to carry out our instructions so as to avoid giving offence on the one hand and to attain our object of obtaining accurate information on the other. I hope we have performed that duty with tolerable success. I am sure the Khedive will admit that we were not wanting in the respect due to his high position; and I must say that His Highness treated us with every consideration, and seemed most desirous of giving us all the information we could desire. Whether this information would have been so readily afforded to the "clever clerk" whom the hon. Member would have substituted for my Mission may be doubted. It has been suggested by the hon. Member that all our information was merely second-hand, and that we were obliged to take what was set before us without asking any questions. That, of course, is in the main true, though not entirely so. We did test what we had opportunities of testing; but, of course, we could hardly be expected in two months to unravel the intricacies and audit the accounts—kept in Arabic—of the Finance Minister. We might have been deceived, no doubt. Still, we had this to rely upon, that though we might easily have been deceived, yet that a person who wished to deceive us would hardly have asked for an experienced English financier to remain in his employment for five or ten years, to whom all the accounts of the Government were to be submitted and by whom the statement furnished to us would, of course, be examined. The result, however, has exceeded my expectations. I fully expected that many errors would be detected and exposed, and was prepared to be satisfied if the truth at length came out amid the conflict of statements. But what has happened? The Report has been before the public for four months. It has been translated into every civilized language, and as far as I know, beyond some very minor details chiefly arising from accidental errors of transcription — the detection of which shows the care with which the Report has been scrutinized—it has been accepted as accurate, and has formed the basis of every negotiation which has up to this time been carried on. The difrence between the French computation d the figures in my Report, I have ready explained, in answer to a Ques- n in the House, to be due to circum- ances which have taken place since my eport was written. I at one time ped that the plan indicated in that eport—not of assisting the Khedive to rrow, as the hon. Member for the Kirk- ldy Boroughs (Sir George Campbell) agines, but of preventing his borrow- g more—would have been carried into fect by capitalists in this country. We d good reason for expecting this; but fortunately our expectations were not alized, and the matter was afterwards mplicated by the extreme pretensions the French holders of Treasury onds, to whom the necessities of the hedive, driven as it were into a corner, bliged him to yield. For this I am in way responsible. Indeed, I told the hedive plainly, and placed it on record, at the acceptance of any plan which d not provide for the full payment of is creditors was really an act of bank- ptcy, and was incompatible with the xpenditure which he was still carrying n. I believed that his liabilities might ave been met then. I believe they ay be met even now, though of course is much more difficult. The total in- ebtedness is far larger than when my eport was written, and the Khedive is ost unfortunately again involved, this ime probably against his will, and in onsequence of the obligations he is nder to the Porte, in the waste of war. am naturally sorry that my own abours did not bear fruit more speedily nd more conspicuously, but I hope that hey may yet be carried to a successful ssue by more fortunate and abler hands. This one merit I may, without presumption, claim for my scheme—namely, that t kept steadily in view the equitable lemands of creditors on the one hand, and on the other the relief of the taxpayer—for whom the hon. Member expresses very natural sympathy—from burdens too heavy for him to bear. It was in order to further both these objects that I laid much stress upon a complete control over both the collection and the appropriation of the revenue, to be vested in the Control Department presided over by the financial agent whom the Khedive was anxious to obtain from this country. This is the key of the whole position. Whatever arrangements may be made in future, I am convinced that such a control must form part of them; and one of the worst features in the Decrees which have been issued in favour of the French scheme is the absence of any security for the independence and permanence of the Control Department. I think I am bound to say a few words, and they shall be very few, on the character of the Khedive, who has sometimes been spoken of in very hard, and in some instances, I think, very unjustifiable terms by a portion of the public Press. The Khedive has been even compared to the late Sultan, but no two characters could be more unlike. The Sultan's fall was preceded by his abdication of the functions and duties of a Sovereign. His vast expenditure was mainly upon unworthy favourites, upon luxury, and debauchery. The Khedive, on the contrary, is the most intelligent and laborious man in his dominions. In his Cabinet early and late, there is hardly any public business with which he is not familiar. He allows himself scarcely any rest or relaxation. His Highness told me once that nothing was so delightful to him as a few weeks' repose at Minieh amid his private estates, but that he had not been able to go there for three years. Profuse in hospitality, proud of entertaining the princely visitors now not unfrequent in Egypt in a princely way, he is frugal and simple in his personal habits. He is, however, obliged to work with the instruments which custom and tradition have handed down to him, to employ officials whom he cannot trust, and whose object is to enrich themselves as rapidly as possible, and to insure against their uncertain tenure of office by plundering the Exchequer. Consequently he endeavours, as many others have done, to manage everything himself, which Rulers of far greater bodily activity would entirely fail to do; and though his knowledge of detail is extraordinary, it is difficult for him to see what it is everybody's interest to conceal. I was once told in Egypt by an eminent official, that the difficulty of educating Arab children lay in the fact that they had no conscience, their only motives being fear and the hope of gain. Probably in consequence of being aware of something of the same kind in others than children, His Highness is too prone to throw himself into the arms of hardly more disinterested foreign advisers who press upon him schemes of various kinds, some good, some crude and ill-considered, but mostly involving heavy expenditure, an undue proportion of which goes into the pockets of these advisers, who are often identical with or closely allied to the contractors who carry out the works, and the financiers who find the means. Loans at ruinous rates, bonds renewed on terms still more ruinous, supplementary contracts in which, for obvious reasons, the Khedive is as much at the mercy of the contractor as the English Post Office used to be in respect of the great steamship companies when contracts were to be renewed. All these have eaten out the resources of the country. The Khedive is of a sanguine disposition, easily impressed with new ideas, which uncontrolled power and impatience of restraint lead him to realize without proper deliberation. Those around him are afraid to tell him the truth. It is most rare for him to find his ideas combated or corrected. The answer of his highest Ministers is usually, "*Arda,*"—"As you please." The customs of the country, polygamy, the system of adoption, the palaces and great establishments considered necessary for the various branches of the ruling family, the practice, as old as ancient Egypt, of never repairing or finishing the work of another, all contribute to the ruinous expenditure. Even Nature appears to encourage this kind of extravagance. The slowness of the growth of trees in the North seems to attach people to one locality. There is no chance of making more than one place in a lifetime. In Egypt, not only is the growth of trees extraordinarily rapid, but the acacia and sycamore can be transplanted at almost full size. The avenue to the Gezeerah Palace, which was not in existence a few years ago, looks as if it had been planted 50 years. It is only fair, however, to mention that the Khedive is the first of his race who has shown an appreciation of the antiquities of his country. In Mohamed Ali's time, the priceless monuments of the past were used as quarries for his bridges and factories. His Highness has collected these objects in a most valuable museum, freely open to the inspection of travellers. The hon. Member talks of the Khedive having done very little. In reply to this, I need only allude to the Bahr Ibrahim, a navigable irrigation canal 160 miles long, fertilizing vast tracts of land. He speaks also of the Khedive originating sugar cultivation, which, he says, is only successful on virgin soil. But I may remind him that Mohamed Ali originated this cultivation, and that the place where sugar pays perhaps best, is the colony of which we have heard so much lately, the island of Barbadoes, where the soil is almost as artificial as in Malta. Still, I agree that the cost of these enterprizes has been enormous; sugar factories unfinished, with expensive machinery lying about; irrigation works, with recent inventions, never completed; experiments half tried—these represent a waste of capital never to be restored. The great body of Europeans resident in the country think only of getting as much as possible out of the general plunder, and of exempting themselves from the taxation to which they ought to contribute. A curious specimen of their character and ideas might be seen in a complaint from Alexandria, in *The Times* of Wednesday last, that high rates of interest could no longer be obtained; that a contract for a thousand quarters of wheat, which used to change hands 30 times, paying 30 brokerages and employing the staffs of 30 merchants, was now made direct by the Government with one exporter, who paid one brokerage, and then sent it out of the country. This was regarded as a sign of degenerate times. The great want, and one we have endeavoured to impress upon the Khedive and to some extent to supply, is that of an official body of high-class Europeans, such, for instance, as our public servants in India—a class which the hon. Member who has just spoken knows well—men accustomed to deal with Native races in outlying Provinces, and to conduct affairs in which tact, integrity, and decision are required. Under such men the railways and Customs duties would produce far more than at present. I have alluded to the uncertain tenure of office. There seems, moreover, to be no system of appointment. We do not expect a complicated system of Civil Service Examinations like our own; but we might suppose that when a man was found fit for his post, he would retain it. Far from it: Ali Pacha, when at the head of the ailway department, proved himself to possess the rare qualities requisite for such a post; but he was suddenly made Governor of Alexandria, and then Master of the Ceremonies at Cairo, where I left him. His successor, Zecchi Pacha, after being several months in office, did not, as we were informed, know whether the French mails went by railway from Cairo to Suez or not. Such men as those I have indicated would also protect the Fellaheen, for whom the hon. Member expresses natural sympathy, from irregular collection of land tax, from *corvées*, and from the many forms of oppression and extortion which cripple their energy, and make them reluctant to apply money to the land, inducing them rather to conceal it and deny the possession of it. The state of the peasantry is highly unsatisfactory, though I doubt their being as wretched as many writers imagine, simply because it is their habit, after the manner of the Jews of the Middle Ages, to make themselves look as poor as possible. But this alone, it must be admitted, implies a great deal. Those, however, among us who have studied the Reports of the various Commissions on the state of women and children employed in mines, factories, and agricultural labour in this country, will acknowledge that we are not justified in being too severe upon a nation only just emerging from barbarism. The hon. Member has asked about the Moukabala. I will not go into figures, for which I refer him to my Report. But, shortly, the Moukabala is the redemption of land tax. I have shown in my Report that it has proved very unfavourable to the Revenue. The Khedive has discovered this, and wishes to put an end to it, which he cannot do without paying the sums advanced by the proprietors. He also inquired about the octroi. In Europe, no doubt, the octroi is received and expended by municipalities; but in Egypt, where everything is done by the central Government, these imposts are paid into the Exchequer, and form part of the general revenue. I feel I have detained the House too long. I could say much more about Egypt and her Ruler—subjects in which I naturally take deep interest. I am bound, however, before sitting down, to direct attention to one or two points: First, to my remarks on the Moukabala in the covering despatch of my Report. This paragraph was published by an accident, for which I alone am responsible; but I promised to explain that the Khedive states that I misunderstood him, that he did not say that he had only recently discovered the error in the calculations of the land tax, but that he thought it had escaped our notice. Secondly, it was alleged in one of the papers that I had submitted my Report to the Khedive in the first instance, and at his request made it more favourable. It is hardly necessary to say that there is not a word of truth in this. The Report was written on my way home and after my return, and was seen by no one outside the Mission, before it was delivered to the Government. I have only one other point upon which I feel bound to touch, and I do so with great pleasure. I feel bound to acknowledge the obligations under which I personally am, and the country in general, in my opinion, is to my colleague, Colonel Stokes, not only for his labours in regard to the Suez Canal arrangement, but for the tact, the intelligence, and the industry he brought to bear upon the work of the Mission, and the valuable assistance he rendered in our interviews with the Khedive and in the preparation of the Report. I am sure no better man could have been chosen to represent British interests on the Suez Canal direction, and I am glad to bear this testimony to one who cannot make his voice heard in this House. Sir, there is still corn in Egypt, and there are not wanting those who are ready to reap where they have not sown; but I trust that they may fail in their machinations, and that better days, and a more lasting, because a more securely founded, prosperity may yet be in store for that interesting and hospitable country, and for its amiable, peaceful, and industrious inhabitants—a country in which there is the greatest security for life and property and the most entire freedom of religious worship, a country in which European ladies, unattended except by Natives, may and do travel in perfect safety from Alexandria to the Second Cataract,—and of how many Christian lands can this be said?—a country in which every Englishman must take especial interest, as the gate of our mighty Empire in India.

Mr. DODSON said, he had listened with great interest to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Cave). The remarks he (Mr. Dodson) had to make would have reference to the policy of the Mission itself, which appeared to have been attended with a fatality of cross purposes amongst those who initiated and conducted it, and the last thing he intended would be to convey the slightest reflection on the right hon. Gentleman, who had been placed in a most difficult position. In October, the Khedive had requested the English Government to send out two gentlemen intimately acquainted with the English system of accounts, to act under the superintendence of his own Chancellor of the Exchequer; but the Government, instead of sending two officers to give him the assistance required to investigate the condition of his finance, had sent out one of their own Colleagues. It did not appear to have been known whether the information obtained was to be regarded as confidential or not. At first, it appeared to have been presumed that it was, and a telegraphic inquiry brought the answer from the Khedive that it was intended solely for the information of our Government. Then, on its being intimated that it was intended to lay the Report before Parliament, publication was objected to by the Khedive pending a certain negotiation, but the Prime Minister described this objection as a general one in the then condition of the Khedive's finances. Next, Lord Derby telegraphed that refusal to consent to publication was injurious; and the Khedive replied that he never refused, but asked only for temporary postponement. The declaration, however, made by the Prime Minister was so prejudicial to the Khedive that he telegraphed requesting immediate and unreserved publication. The Khedive was placed in this dilemma —that whereas immediate publication was injurious to him, such a situation was created for him that non-publication was worse. At least four different versions of the confidential nature of the Report were given; but after all that had been said, and after all the withholding of information on the part of the Government, there was the despatch of the Khedive showing that he wished the Report only withheld for a short time pending the appointment of a Commissioner. In fact, the Khedive had shown that he only wished for a momentary delay in the publication of the Papers. There was one other point to which he wished to call attention, and that was, that there had been a very narrow escape of this country being to some extent involved in the responsibilities of Egyptian finance. Lord Derby telegraphed to the Khedive at a most critical moment in the condition of his affairs, to await the arrival of Mr. Rivers Wilson, and to abstain from hasty action because proposals were under the consideration of English financiers, but those proposals came to nothing, and it was then necessary for Lord Derby to telegraph that the Government had no proposal before them, and could not originate any, so that we raised false hopes and expectations. Lord Derby, in his last despatch, declared the Mission had been of undoubted benefit to the Khedive, but it was difficult to see how this could be when his bonds had since fallen in value from between 50 and 60 to 40; and, indeed, the Khedive himself was reported to have said of the English Government—*Ils ont creusé ma fosse.* The Khedive was willing to abide by the plan sketched in Mr. Cave's Report, but the voluntary conversion of a debt of £75,000,000 required the assistance of bankers and capitalists, and, as they did not come forward, the plan could not be carried out. The only chance for the right hon. Gentleman's scheme was the assistance of great capitalists. How otherwise could the Khedive be expected to carry it into effect, as Lord Derby told him he might, unless compulsorily. According to the Correspondence, Her Majesty's Government were asked to appoint a Commissioner as one of the International Commission to carry out the plan recommended by Mr. Cave. On the 21st of April, Lord Derby telegraphed to inform the Khedive that he had heard with satisfaction that he proposed to adopt the plan proposed in Mr. Cave's Report, and told His Highness that the Government would have much pleasure in suggesting or recommending a Commissioner. Now, the plan recommended in what was known as Mr. Cave's Report, involved the appointment of a Commission which was to receive a certain part of the Revenue, which was to be handed over to them, and by them applied to the payment of Debt, and it further involved that His Highness was not to interfere with the Committee of Control, nor to raise any fresh loans without the consent of the Committee of Control. But the defect of that scheme was that either the Commission would have no powers to carry out this proposal, or the Khedive would be deprived of his Sovereign rights. The Government, however, had gone very far in coquetting with the appointment of some Commissioner. After the Khedive had agreed to the French scheme, Lord Derby declined to recommend a Commissioner to form one of the International Commission. He (Mr. Dodson) did not mean to say that the refusal to recommend a Commissioner was not valid and good; but he regretted that the Government had committed themselves so far, that Lord Derby should have found it necessary to explain himself out of the recommendation. The scheme of Mr. Cave was a voluntary scheme, but the scheme adopted by the Khedive was a compulsory one. Lord Derby, however, was too far committed to be able to get off on that ground, and therefore he said he would not recommend a Commissioner, because the amount of Debt was larger than was stated in Mr. Cave's Report; that the charge would be £1,000,000 more, and so on. All these things, which might be traced through the Correspondence, showed that Her Majesty's Government went rashly into the business, and that they had been at cross purposes with the Egyptian Government all through. If he were called upon to sum up the result of this Mission, which was described by Lord Derby as having been such an undoubted benefit to the Khedive, he should say, shortly that the Mission was a *fiasco*, the Report was waste paper, that we had done no good to the Khedive, no credit to ourselves, and certainly had not improved our relations with the Government of Egypt.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the last words of the right hon. Gentleman rather reminded him of an expression in *Shakespeare*, "I knew I should have your good word." Indeed, the Government had never expected anything else when the subject came to be discussed, than that the right hon. Gentleman would not spare them any comments which he thought would be disagreeable. But when the right hon. Gentleman described the Mission of his (the Chancellor of the Exchequer's) right hon. Friend the Member for Shoreham as a total *fiasco*, and the Report as being so much waste paper, it was to be regretted that his Colleague the right hon. Member for the City (Mr. Goschen) was not sitting beside him, because he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) would have liked to have asked that right hon. Gentleman whether he considered the Mission such an entire *fiasco* as the right hon. Member for Chester would have them believe, or the Report to be simply waste paper as he gave them to understand? Whatever else might be said with respect to the Mission, he was inclined to think that the Report which his right hon. Friend had laid before the country and the world, and which had been subjected to such severe and minute criticism by, it might be, interested persons, and persons who had all kinds of information, had stood a very severe test, and one point was clear —which was that his right hon. Friend had obtained a large amount of valuable information, and had put it together in a form which rendered it a valuable authority, and in all the schemes which were afloat it had been taken as the basis of information on which great reliance might be placed. He really felt that it was necessary to make these observations in answer to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman; but, of course, the criticisms which he had made were perfectly legitimate criticisms, and the questions were questions which it was fair that they should be called upon to answer. He was afraid that it would be inconvenient at that time, when it was to a certain extent after the interest in the matter had subsided, and that it also would be unfair of him to detain the House by going at very great length into the minute particulars which he might enter into, and he would therefore endeavour in what he had to say to confine his observations to following as far as he could the line which had been taken up by the right hon. Gentleman, and explain the points which he had thought it necessary to call the attention of the House to. The right hon. Gentleman said that that business had been marked by a series of blunders, and that they had on many points been at cross purposes with the Government of the Khedive. Now, in the first place, with regard to the origin of the Mission, the right hon. Gentleman said that the origin of the Mission was, that the Khedive had applied to them for a gentleman or gentlemen, possibly to assist in the management of his finances, and that what he required was one or two clerks of business-like habits and experience in business matters; and that instead of that, they sent him a Gentleman of high rank, one of their own Colleagues, with instructions that he was to assist the Khedive in various ways, which, after all, he never did assist him in. But let them bear in mind the history of that Mission. It was perfectly true that the application was made by the Khedive in the first instance for two gentlemen who were to go out and assist him in his financial department. But when the application came the course taken was this—the Foreign Office receiving it communicated with the Treasury, and the Treasury took time to consider the matter, for they felt some little hesitation and some difficulty as to the class of persons to be sent, as to the precise amount of responsibility the Government would assume in recommending one person more than another; and they also felt there might be some difficulty as to the instructions and stipulations which they might have to give to those persons when they were to enter the service of the Khedive. The Government were considering those points when an interlude occurred which very much altered the position and increased the importance of what they were about to do. That interlude was the purchase of the Suez Canal shares. The Mission of his right hon. Friend was in many respects distinct from the question of the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, and the right hon. Gentleman had treated it apart from that question. He would try to follow the right hon. Gentleman's example as much as possible, but he was not able entirely to separate the two matters, because they were in their origin closely connected, and, in point of fact, the reasons which led the Government to take the one step had considerable relations to the reasons which induced them to take the other. It was said by some that in the purchase of those shares Her Majesty's Government intended to make a great commercial speculation, by others that they aimed at great political objects, by others that they were coming forward to assist the Khedive, and various other explanations had been given as to the grounds of the purchase which had been made. But the action taken by the Government was not upon any of those grounds. Of course, in taking a step of that sort many considerations entered into the mind of the Government, and into some of those considerations it was not necessary that he should then enter. But this was one very leading consideration. The Suez Canal was important to us, and not to us only, but to Europe at large, especially as the highway to the East. It was also valuable property, capable of being converted into money in the hands of the Khedive, and Her Majesty's Government were aware that the Khedive was in a position in which it was necessary for him to raise money. Her Majesty's Government, therefore, were anxious lest he should make use of the valuable property which he held in the Canal in order to get money in some way that might be prejudicial to the interests of this country. They felt that it would be of great importance to this country and to European interests that by one and the same action a considerable command of the Canal should be obtained by England, so that there might be no fear of its falling into the hands of others who might make use of it inconveniently to England, and to Europe generally, and by the same transaction they would improve the position of the Khedive, and enable him to meet pressing difficulties, by advancing money on those shares. Well, upon these considerations the Canal shares were purchased, and then they had again to take up the question which was still before them as to what they were going to do with respect to giving the Khedive assistance in the way of officers to advise him in the financial question. That was not originated by the Canal shares, but had assumed a greater importance in consequence of that transaction; and various considerations necessarily imported themselves into the question. They had to consider what was likely to be the effect of that purchase, and what use the Khedive would make of the £4,000,000. One of their objects in giving the money was to get him out of his financial difficulties; therefore, they were anxious that he should be well advised as to the mode in which he should apply that money, so that it might not be thrown into the sea or spent in useless works. They were anxious again to ascertain for themselves whether there were any reasons why they should take further securities than they had done with regard to their position in connection with the Suez Canal—what would be the measures most desirable to be taken—whether it was desirable to have separate arrangements as to the constitution of the Company, which to a certain extent was under the Khedive's patronage. On these grounds they thought the best course would be to send out a Gentleman of such position, experience, and weight, that he would be able both to give advice to His Highness and obtain for them valuable and useful information. They thought that by associating Mr. Cave and Colonel Stokes they should best obtain the ends they had in view. They believed they were thus doing a good service to Egypt and likely to put matters on a proper footing between Egypt and themselves. But they did not lose sight of the original ground on which they were proceeding. The original ground was the request of the Khedive that they should send out a gentleman or gentlemen who might assist him in his financial department. [Mr. LOWE: Might assist his Ministers.] That was a very refined distinction, he thought; but, at all events, they were asked, as, he had said, to send out a gentleman or gentlemen to assist—he would not say whom—but in the financial administration of Egypt. They bore in mind that the Mission of Mr. Cave had for its preliminary object, as regarded the relations between England and the Khedive, to ascertain what sort of person should be sent, what position he would occupy; and the result was that Mr. Cave did give them such information that they selected Mr. Rivers Wilson to go, as the gentleman the Khedive had asked for. He, therefore, said there was no cross purpose in the matter; the gentleman sent did fulfil the Mission the Khedive had requested them to undertake—to send out a gentleman competent to render him the assistance required. He might appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) himself whether in making that selection they had not made a good one, or whether they could have made a better? But, said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Chester, while all this was going on, Mr. Cave was preparing his Report. He sent it home, and a question then arose whether that Report was to be published, or whether it should be considered confidential? He gave that as an instance of cross purposes on the part of the Government. Well, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) was not at the moment prepared to go through every one of the Questions put in the House—every one of the communications made at one or another time on that subject, but he would wish to point out to the House that when they were continually being asked a Question here and a Question there, and when they were expected to give an answer at the moment, it was very difficult not to give an answer which might seem in a certain way contradictory or inconsistent with another answer given at another time, because the circumstances of the case might vary from time to time, and they could not be fully aware how much of the information at the time was subsequent to the Report. He certainly was not aware, at first, how far it might be fit to publish the Report, for it was not even written in February when he gave the first reply to a Question on the subject — at all events, it was not communicated to the Government, although he was privately made aware of what its general character would be, yet he was unaware how far it would have to be considered confidential. When it was sent to them they were aware that the information was obtained from the Khedive, but not under the seal of confidence, and the question was, whether they could publish it without his permission. At the same time, they considered, as the information was not of a character that could be considered confidential, the Khedive should have no objection to its being printed. They communicated with him on the subject, Mr. Cave having authorized them to say that nothing in the Report had been communicated to him under the seal of confidence. Then came the question whether they should publish it or not. At that moment the position of Egyptian finance was somewhat critical. There were hopes that an arrangement would be made which might be deranged by the publication of his right hon. Friend's

Report, unless, indeed, they were prepared to come forward and assist the Khedive. Therefore, it was said there was inconsistency again between what his right hon. Friend at the head of the Government had said as to the unsettled state of Egyptian finance being the reason for not publishing the Report, and the explanation which the Khedive himself afterwards gave. But the Khedive was naturally anxious to get assistance from Her Majesty's Government of a practical kind—he was anxious for a Commissioner, who might carry with him authority, to be nominated by the British Government. He might not have rightly understood the difficulties, but he believed that by urging upon them the nomination of a Commissioner, and by objecting to the publication of the Report, he might put a pressure upon them to induce them to comply with his wishes. They were not able to comply, and the result was that the Report had to be withheld, simply because the Khedive objected. They were obliged to tell the truth. They withheld it not from any feeling of their own, but because the Khedive objected to its publication. If there was any confusion occasioned by the short answer his right hon. Friend the Prime Minister was obliged to give, it was, to a great extent, due to the unfortunate position in which he was placed on the occasion of being obliged to give an answer which might be abrupt and could not enter into the full circumstances of the case. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) explained the matter immediately afterwards—the next day he thought—and he pointed out that his right hon. Friend, in his reply, had no intention of bringing discredit upon Egyptian finance, or of implying that there was anything in the Report damaging to Egyptian credit. It was simply to the effect that arrangements were in progress; and in that sense, it was perfectly correct to speak of those arrangements as being in an unsettled state. Not being settled, they were rightly described as being in an unsettled state. There was another point which the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Dodson) touched. He took notice of an expression which occurred in a telegram from Lord Derby to Egypt. The expression used was this—

> "Government have reason to know that proposals are under the consideration of certain English financiers, which may lead to a satisfactory settlement of the Khedive's affairs. You should urge His Highness to abstain from any hasty action, and at least to await the arrival in Egypt of Mr. Rivers Wilson."

The right hon. Gentleman commented on some expressions of the Khedive, and threw on the Government the responsibility of the position. The circumstances were these—The net result of his right hon. Friend's Mission to Egypt—its primary purpose was the selection of Mr. Rivers Wilson, according to the request of the Khedive. They communicated this while his right hon. Friend was still in Egypt. The Khedive expressed satisfaction with the selection of that gentleman, and requested that Mr. Rivers Wilson might be sent out quickly; at the same time, he expected that there would no longer be any occasion for Mr. Cave to remain in Egypt—he hoped Mr. Rivers Wilson would be sent out and that Mr. Cave would return. His right hon. Friend accordingly proceeded to leave Egypt and come home; but Mr. Rivers Wilson, who was preparing to go out to Egypt, naturally put himself into communication with the Khedive's representatives here, and with Egypt by telegraph, and he was instructed by the Khedive to endeavour, before he left England, at all events before he left Europe, to make some arrangement for giving effect to what might be agreed upon as desirable. The Government, having once nominated Mr. Rivers Wilson, and being informed that the Khedive was pleased with the selection, considered themselves entirely released—dissociated from any further proceeding which Mr. Wilson might take as the Khedive's servant. That gentleman was in Paris making arrangements in the service of the Khedive. Of what those arrangements consisted the Government were not cognizant, although they had reason to believe that Mr. Wilson had hopes that they would end in a successful result. All of a sudden the Khedive thought it desirable to send to the French Government to ask for a gentleman to be sent to him for financial advice. The Government were surprised at this information, which came upon them suddenly, and they thought it possible that the Khedive might not be aware of what was going on, and might think that Mr. Wilson was not coming, and they thought it well to let him know hat Mr. Wilson was on his way. Mr. Vilson had, in fact, left Paris, and was omewhere upon his journey, and they equested the Khedive not to take any eps until he saw Mr. Wilson. Having ent his right hon. Friend on a Mission o Egypt, and he having proposed a cheme, and having selected a gentleman ully competent to carry out financial rrangements, they did feel it unfortu- ate to hear that the Khedive had ap- lied to France for assistance, and they eared that it was owing to some mis- pprehension. They, as Her Majesty's overnment, had no communication with apitalists, and nothing to propose. hey only wanted to know what the Khedive had to propose. That was the xplanation of that point. Then the right on. Gentleman the Member for Chester ommented upon some expression used y Lord Derby in which the noble Lord spoke of the undoubted benefit which had resulted to His Highness and to Egyptian finance, and further remarked hat the Egyptian Funds had fallen, and hat the Khedive was reported to have said we had dug his grave. Of course, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) could not say what expression His Highness might have used on this or that occasion. It was not unnatural that as the Khedive was pressing them to appoint a Commissioner to assist him in a scheme for the consolidation and reduction of his Debt, he should use every kind of argument to show that the position was due to them, and they should assist him out of it. Every sort of argument was natural, and for his purpose legitimate to use. As to the Egyptian Funds falling, was it an advantage to keep them up? They fell because of the light which was let in upon matters, and discovering what was not before known. What was the process going on in Egypt before the Mission of his right hon. Friend the Member for Shoreham? Egypt was subject to a large fixed Debt—a considerable Debt—not a Debt which was crushing to the resources of the country, but still a considerable Debt, and in addition Egypt was burdened with the weight of floating debt, with obligations which would shortly have to be met. It was a necessity that the Khedive should meet his obligations, and the consequence was that money had to be raised at sacrifices ruinous for the future, and a house of cards was built up in the form of a floating debt. And the state of things must have got worse; the time must have come when the floating debt must be paid, and then Egypt would be brought to a state of bankruptcy. "What was the benefit?" asked the right hon. Gentleman. Did he not think there was a benefit when the Khedive was involving himself in loans at 20, 30, and 40 per cent? Was it not desirable to bring such a state of things to a conclusion? Was it not, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) would ask, a benefit to Egypt to stop such a state things? He would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London whether there would be any advantage in going on with a fool's paradise, supposing all things pleasant, till the crash came—all the heavier for being thus deferred? It was, he thought, the truest friendship and the wisest policy to bring the light to bear upon the course being pursued, and, as far as possible, to mark the path of safety. Egypt, he further thought, had claims upon them. They had instructed her in that pleasant vice of borrowing. Western Europe had done a great deal to encourage that which had undoubtedly been to Egypt the source of considerable confusion. Was it not their duty to take steps to point out to those going a pleasant, though dangerous, road where that danger was? What was the benefit to the Khedive? Why, was it not a benefit to put a stop to a system of so much danger—a danger which would lead, perhaps, to foreign intervention or Heaven knows what, if the evil were not stopped? The right hon. Gentleman had questioned whether the scheme propounded in the Report was workable or not. Well, although capitalists were not at once found to take up the proposal, it was one, at all events, which was not manifestly unworkable, and it did not require the raising of a large loan of £70,000,000 or £75,000,000. The scheme had many advantages, and might have been adopted had the Khedive issued a decree such as he had since had recourse to. But upon that point he did not think it necessary to enter. The scheme had been presented to the world, and it was one on which the Khedive was able to form his own judgment. The right hon. Gentleman had also spoken of a narrow escape from serious responsibilities. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) could not help thinking a great deal too much was made of that. The Government had agreed to nominate a gentleman as Commissioner for certain purposes, and what, after all, were the purposes the Khedive had in view? Not only did his right hon. Friend the Member for Shoreham obtain a large amount of information, but he pointed out the way in which it was desirable to administer the finances. And what were the responsibilities? If a gentleman was required to receive the revenues on one hand, and apply them to the relief of the Debt on the other hand, they would have been exempt from all responsibility. The gentleman would be in the service of the Khedive, and their responsibility would only go so far as they recommended him as a capable and honest man, and that responsibility, he thought, it was not worth while to discuss. It was not the first time that gentlemen had been requested from this country for matters of the kind. There was, for instance, the case of Tunis. Well, he did not know that that was a case in point, but such cases had occurred, and there was nothing in the nature of the thing unreasonable or compromising to this country. Having given that brief outline of the history of his right hon. Friend's Mission, and having, he thought, touched upon those points the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Chester referred to, he felt it would at that time be unreasonable to trespass further upon the House, and should any further questions arise in regard to the subject, he should have an opportunity of meeting them in Committee.

Mr. LOWE: Sir, we have commenced the Session with discussions on this subject, and it seems that we are about to end it with them. I hope, therefore, I may be excused if I take a leaf out of the book of successful dramatists, and, as I think not inaptly, term the drama which the right hon. Gentleman has gone over "the decline and fall of Egyptian credit," and I should be inclined to divide its parts into four acts, or *tableaux*. The first of those acts may, I think, be named "intrusion;" the second, "inquisition;" the third, "suppression;" and the fourth and last, "repudiation;" and though I cannot expect the right hon. Gentleman opposite to see at once the force of that nomenclature, I hope it will be made apparent in the course of my remarks. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer has just told us that the Khedive applied for a person or persons—he did not seem to know which—to assist him in the re-organization of his finances. Now, a great deal depends on what the Khedive really did apply for, and we find from the Papers that Nubar Pasha, addressing General Stanton, asked for two persons who might be placed in the Finance Department of Egypt, under the orders of the Minister of Finance, in the two divisions of that Department, one of which has the direction of the receipts and the other the direction of expenditure. It is as plain as words can make it that what the Khedive asked for was not anybody to advise or anybody to re-organize his finances. He did not ask for anybody of high trust or confidence, but simply for two persons, one of whom, as he says with some simplicity, should know something of political economy, to work under the Finance Minister, and they were to be persons who had a good financial education in England. That was the whole demand out of which these transactions have sprung, and nothing is more remarkable than the way in which this has all arisen through a small and insignificant request for two skilful clerks. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says—"We could not tell at all how to deal with such a question. It puzzled the whole wisdom of the Treasury. What sort of clerks did they want? What were the duties they were to perform? What would have been their status under the Khedive? All these things were so difficult that we could not undertake to deal with them." The consequence was, that the request has never been complied with to this day, and the two clerks asked for have never been sent; but the Treasury and Foreign Secretary laid down this extraordinary doctrine—that in order to find out what sort of men these two clerks were to be, and what were to be their salaries and their position with the Khedive, it was necessary to send out an envoy, as they call him, to make inquiries into the subject, so that when he had thoroughly ransacked the finances of Egypt from one end to the other he might come home and report to the Government exactly what sort of clerks should be sent out. An envoy was aclingly sent out in the person of the ht hon. Gentleman the Member for reham, and no doubt a better person ld not have been selected for the job e only knew what the job was. He provided with every possible adjunct well his natural dignity to the proper portions in the eyes of the Khedive. this I do not deny, but what I say is t this thing was done without its ever ng asked for by the Khedive, and hout his ever expressing the slightest h that anything of the sort should be le. It was the misfortune of the edive to ask for these two poor clerks, l upon that we forced upon him this oy without his having an opportunity saying whether he would like to see envoy or not. This forms the first of the drama, which I venture to call the name of "intrusion." There is the least ground for saying that the edive asked for such a thing at all, that he wished to have an envoy in land of Egypt to take stock of his airs. The right hon. Gentleman the ancellor of the Exchequer, feeling t that part of the case is rather weak, nt into a digression, into which I do mean to follow him, in regard to at happened in the purchase of the ez Canal shares; and what he seemed say—though I doubt whether he will nit my construction of his words— that we bought these shares for ,000,000, on the personal security of Khedive, to pay a certain amount of erest, and having entered upon the nsaction and thus bound ourselves we ought it was right to send out some e to see what was our chance of being id. The Chancellor of the Exchequer ems to see no other reason for the ssion except that we had spent a very ge sum of money on which we got a ry doubtful security indeed, and when found ourselves bound we thought it cessary to send out to see whether should ever get our money back ain. I believe, with the Chancellor the Exchequer, that the purchase of ese Suez Canal shares had a great al to do with the sending out of the ght hon. Gentleman the Member for oreham, but in a different way. Un- rtunately, as I think, for the Khedive, ese affairs happened to come at a pe- liar moment. The letters dealing ith this subject are dated the 26th No- mber last, and on the 27th November the world was delighted and electrified by the information of the splendid property we had acquired in these canal shares. All right-minded people were in raptures at the prospect before them. It was believed that we were about to take possession of Egypt. Everybody was enchanted with the whole thing, and the Prime Minister and everybody else were in the height of human glory. It is not the time now to inquire whether that position has been maintained, but every pretext, and no pretext at all, was greedily laid hold of to increase the belief of the public that we had at last got a high-minded policy in connection with affairs in the East, and that we were going to take a more prominent part than we had done for years in the affairs of Europe. I trace much more to that feeling, than to any desire to find out how much salary two clerks were to have, the fact that this splendid Mission was sent out. This concludes the first *tableaux* of "intrusion." The next is "inquisition." The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham was sent out to inquire, without leave asked or given, into the Khedive's finances, and he did his duty, as he would be sure to do it, most fairly, assiduously, and honourably. He has collected together a great mass of information; but it appears to me to be one of the most remarkable things in this history that such a Mission for such a purpose should have been forced and foisted upon an independent country that never asked for it, and that it should have been maintained at the Khedive's expense, and at a very large expense indeed. I cannot help thinking that it would have been more proper, and more worthy of this country, if the Mission had not been maintained at the Khedive's expense, and I should like to hear something more upon this subject. It was bad enough to go without leave to examine into the state of Egyptian finances and to publish them to the whole world, without quartering ourselves on the Khedive; but, of course, all this rests upon the assumption that we did send out the right hon. Gentleman and his suite to be supported by the Khedive, and not at the expense of the British Government. Information was collected, and this forms my second *tableaux* of "inquisition." We sent out persons with no right whatever to inquire, but the Khedive being in difficulties and almost at his wit's end, he was glad no doubt to do almost anything in the hope of getting some assistance of some kind or another. The House will observe that the words used in sending out the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham on his Mission was that he was to inquire what assistance we were to give the Khedive, though the words are somewhat ambiguous. The two clerks grew somehow or other till they seemed to involve the question—at least in the minds of the people of England, though I do not know how far they involved it in the minds of the Government—whether we were not to give some very great pecuniary assistance of some kind beyond the £4,000,000 which we were to pay for the Canal Shares. That was the question which had to be solved by the inquisition. I now close the second *tableaux*—that of the "inquisition"—and come to the third, which I venture to call "suppression." The Report was finished, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham returned to England. Then the Prime Minister was asked whether he would produce the right hon. Gentleman's Report, and he said in substance, though I cannot give his exact words, that the Khedive was unwilling that it should be published, and therefore he could not allow it. When we look into the Papers we find that that, of course unintentionally, is not a fair representation of the views of the Khedive. The day before he made that statement he received a telegram stating that His Highness strongly objected to the publication of the Report at present, and information which had been given to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham was confidential, and intended solely for the information of Her Majesty's Government, and the Khedive went on to say in that telegram that, if the publication was not preceded by an arrangement with English financiers or by the nomination of an English Commissioner, any discussion of Egyptian finance must be prejudicial to his interests, and would prevent a solution of his difficulties; but he added that he would not object to the publication of the Report at the conclusion of such an arrangement as he had mentioned or after the nomination of a Commissioner. He trusted, finally, that Her Majesty's Government would not place him in the false position which would ensue from the premature publication of the righ hon. Gentleman's Report. The fact was that the Khedive objected to the publication of the Report till he knew th mind of Her Majesty's Governmen with regard to Egypt and what the were prepared to do for him. It wa most unfortunate that the Prime Minister in making his statement should hav told us in substance that the Khediv objected to the publication of the Report——

Mr. DISRAELI: In the unsatisfactory state of affairs I read the telegra to the House, and it was in the languag of the Khedive himself.

Mr. LOWE: I think not. I hav read the telegram of the Khedive, an I will read the words of the right hon Gentleman.

Mr. DISRAELI: The right hon Gentleman is correct.

Mr. LOWE: The right hon. Gentl man said in substance that the Khediv objected to the publication, and th effect had been that the finances Egypt from that moment had never r covered the blow. It gave a mort wound, from which they have nev rallied since. I do not make any charg against the right hon. Gentleman the matter, except that he only confine himself to the Khedive's refusal allow the publication, without statin the concomitant part of the subjec which showed that the Khedive con sidered that Her Majesty's Governme were about to give him some assistan in some shape or other. I make charge against anybody, but the effe of the unfortunate suppression of tho words has been absolutely destructive the finances of Egypt, which nev rallied from the blow from that time this. This concludes the third act the drama, and then there is a litt interlude, which I should like to me tion. It has been said that the Khedi asked for Mr. Rivers Wilson or som one else to be sent out, but I cann find anything in the Papers to sho that he made any request of the kin I remember that the right hon. Gent man the Chancellor of the Exchequ told us in this House that the Gover ment had declined to send out M Rivers Wilson to advise the Khediv or something of that kind; but I nev heard a word, and I see nothing in th Papers to show, that the Khedive h r asked for Mr. Wilson to be sent . As to supposing for a moment t any person in the position of Mr. lson, and going out in the manner which he was sent, would be sent out fulfil the wish of the Khedive for clerks to assist in the Finance Dertment, that is simply ridiculous. It not likely that a gentleman holding office he held would be sent out to in a small Department under the yptian Minister. That also, as I derstood it, is another intrusion on part of the Government, but not ually blameable, because they did not nd out Mr. Wilson as an inquisitor get information, which might be used eatly to the injury of the Government Egypt, but, as I understand the mat-, it was a very considerable liberty to nd him out, unless they had made up eir minds to some definite policy. hat was the result? Mr. Wilson was nt out, and a little while afterwards legrams were sent to him telling him the most peremptory manner to re-rn, as he would be doing nothing but schief by staying longer, and that erefore the best thing he could do was come back as soon as possible, and at he did. That is the history of e transactions with Egypt, but then mes the tragical part of the drama. ord Derby, in a very remarkable ssage, finds himself under the neces-ty of disentangling himself and the overnment from all these complicated ansactions which have been attended y so small a result; and he declares one of his despatches that at this ncture the right hon. Gentleman the ember for Shoreham arrived at Cairo, nd that the information given to him y the Government of Egypt led him believe that, great as they were, the ifficulties in the case were not insur-ountable, and that the Khedive would e able to maintain his Government, nd to discharge his obligations within reasonable time and on reasonable erms, without the imposition of fresh urdens upon his subjects. That opinion, oming from the right hon. Gentleman, as entitled to every respect, but I may ark two things. There was some error n the way in which the revenue was stimated on account of the Moukabala iminishing rather faster than he thought t did, and also there will be a consider-ble difference in the expenditure for which he is not responsible, because he could only act upon the information which was given to him; and though I do not doubt that he took every trouble to get the matter correctly, still his information must partake of the weakness of the source from which he got it. The result of the matter was that whereas he estimated the debt of the Khedive at £77,500,000, the amount is brought out to £91,000,000. Then Lord Derby goes on to say that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham accordingly prepared a scheme which was so framed as to satisfy these important conditions without interfering with the independent action of the Khedive within his own dominions, and that though no doubt it involved to a certain extent an arrangement with creditors, such as England would always be an unwilling party to, it did provide ultimately for the payment of the Debt, and thus the Mission of the right hon. Member for Shoreham had been an undoubted benefit to His Highness. The House will observe that Lord Derby says the Mission had been of undoubted benefit, not to Egypt, but to the Khedive. Now, this arrangement had one misfortune—it would not work. We remember Moore's imaginary criticism of a friend's novel—

> " Clever work, Sir!—would get up exceedingly well—
> The only fault is—that it never would sell!
> And though statesmen may glory in being unbought,
> In an author, we think, Sir, that's rather a fault."

This admirable scheme would not work for good and sufficient reasons. It was a scheme by which a large quantity of stocks were to be made into a single consolidated stock, and that could well be done in one of two ways, either by the consent of every single bondholder, or by purchasing the interest of those who would not agree. Both these courses were, however, impossible, and the scheme accordingly failed. Lord Derby gives us as reason why the Mission has been of great benefit to the Khedive, that the right hon. Gentleman devised a scheme which would not work. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke differently of it. He did not look at it in the same light as Lord Derby. He did not see how a scheme which, however innocent and well meant, turned out to be utterly abortive, could be of great benefit to the Khedive. "In the first place," he says, "we did not send out the right hon. Gentleman to benefit Egypt, but at the request of the Khedive, to assist him with his finances." That is the way in which he puts it, and that is the only way of course to justify it. If it had not been done for that reason it would have been a simple outrage. But he said it would benefit Egypt. Well, how did it benefit Egypt? Why, the Mission and the answer of the Prime Minister together produced such a state of Egyptian finance that the Khedive found himself perfectly unable to get on with the system of financing which he had adopted; and I dare say it is a good thing when people become insolvent that their affairs should be brought to an end. Therefore, it may have been a benefit to Egypt just as it may have been a benefit to England for a man to go through the Bankruptcy Court when he cannot pay any longer. What I say is that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer has substituted the word "Egypt" for "His Highness," which is the phrase in the despatch; secondly, I say that it was not for this that the right hon. Gentleman was sent out; and, thirdly, I say that in no one way has it benefited Egypt except in this, that it has forced upon the Khedive a declaration of insolvency and repudiation, and enforced suspension of payments, and all those plans for reduction of interest and unification of stock. These are not transactions such as take place between individuals; they are all high-handed acts of power by a debtor who cannot pay, and who chooses to select the terms as to what he will pay, whom he will pay, and how he will pay; not because such a course is right or proper, but because his creditors have no remedy against him. If the right hon. Gentleman will take the credit of this, I should be very sorry that the country should share it with him; for, though it may be the best thing for the Khedive of Egypt, I quite agree with Lord Derby that England does not look with much favour on these enforced settlements, and therefore I call this the closing act of the tragedy "repudiation;" first of all, because Lord Derby repudiates any intention to help the Khedive after all the hopes held out to him by the manner in which the Mission was announced to this House; and, secondly, because the result of the Report of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham was to hasten the repudiation which has taken place in Egypt. That is the whole nature of this transaction. First, you take the most marvellous pretext in the world, and avail yourselves of it, to force on a friendly nation an inquisition which nobody called for and did not desire; secondly, you held that inquisition; thirdly, you continue to persistently withhold the Report of that inquisition, and then to publish it, first casting a slur upon it by not giving reasons for not publishing it; and, fourthly, by this course you strike a fatal blow at the finances of Egypt, which ends in an act of repudiation on the part of the Government, and then you take credit to yourselves for producing that result. That is a plain statement of the case, and I commend it to the consideration of the right hon. Gentleman and the House.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Chester (Mr. Dodson) had described the Mission of his right hon. Friend the Member for Shoreham (Mr. Cave) as being a *fiasco*, but he (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) considered the present debate the most complete *fiasco* of the Session. The right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Lowe) had endeavoured to treat the subject with dramatic propriety, and had divided it into four acts—intrusion, inquisition, suppression, and repudiation. As connected with the first of those acts, as regarded the appointment of the two clerks, the Khedive had asked for them on October 24 when there was no idea of the purchase of the shares in the Suez Canal. He considered that act as most important in the interest of Egypt and of England. It was a great political act, and was especially important as ensuring the way to our Indian possessions. The right hon. Gentleman said that the British Government had intruded Mr. Cave upon the Khedive; but the fact was that on November 29, two days after the purchase of the shares, Lord Derby telegraphed to General Stanton that the Government proposed that Mr. Cave should go on a special Mission to Egypt, to advise on financial matters. General Stanton telegraphed back to say that he had given the information to the Khedive, and that His Highness appeared grati-

and thankful at the announcement. s that intrusion? Then as to inquisi- , His Highness the Viceroy had ertaken to give every information to right hon. Friend the Member for reham. The object was to obtain information as might be important to Egypt and to England. It was likely that two clerks would be en- ted with such a Mission, but these tlemen went as subaltern officers. vas true that these shares were bought hurry, but the boldness of the act justified considering the state of key, and it was our duty to seek to vent Egyptian finance from falling the state of decay in which finance Constantinople was involved. As to charge of suppression, what was the l blow to the finance of Egypt of ch they had been told? The Report supposed to contain the truth with rence to Egypt, and because it was satisfactory, Egyptian finance had recovered its depression. He be- ved it had done a great deal of good. had reduced the finances of that ntry to its proper level, and investors ght not to be blamed for acts which ry honest man should defend. What- r harm was done by the telegram of Government which spoke of financial posals, was undone by subsequent ex- nations when Mr. Wilson and the ench Commissioners were at Cairo. e Mission of Mr. Cave had been of at advantage to the Khedive, because had, as he said, reduced Egyptian ance to its proper level, and had own the people of France to whom y could lend and to what extent, and en the Report was published it pro- ced that effect. The right hon. Gentle- n opposite (Mr. Lowe) had sought to ke a distinction between the Khedive d Egypt, but if the Mission had been neficial to Egypt it must have been also to the Khedive. What did the ght hon. Gentleman mean by saying that is measure had forced on bankruptcy? ow could bankruptcy have been pre- nted if it was so likely to take place? is right hon. Friend the Member for oreham (Mr. Cave) was not going take out money. Bankruptcy arose om the absence of assets and re- urces, and on its being found that the sets would not meet the liabilities, d if his right hon. Friend had not ne out the state of things would have been much worse. With respect to Mr. Wilson's recall, the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Lowe) said it was peremptory, but it was not so, for it was entirely at Mr. Wilson's own suggestion. He telegraphed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say that he could not approve the scheme in consequence of the heavy burden upon the taxpayers; and after that it was, of course, impossible that he could be allowed to remain to carry on negotiations in a policy which he did not approve. He (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) conceived that the Government had done its duty. They had shown that England was determined to maintain her position in the Mediterranean, to keep open the thoroughfare to India, and that she was desirous to enable the Khedive to administer the affairs of a country in which he held so great an interest. With regard to another matter referred to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London, it was a condition made by the Viceroy that Mr. Cave should be entertained by him, for it was at that moment more than ever necessary that he should not depart from those rules of Eastern hospitality which had always been observed by the Rulers of Egypt.

SIR GEORGE ELLIOT said, that he very seldom trespassed upon the time of the House; and he would not have done so on that occasion if he had not taken such an active part in the subject under discussion. He had had a long acquaintance with Egyptian matters, and had resided in the country for some time; and he therefore thought that he could speak with some authority on the matter. In listening to the debate he could endorse what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the purchase of the Suez Canal shares was a most proper measure as regarded the interests of this country, and that it had, in a manner, led up to the appointment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham (Mr. Cave) to go on the Mission which he had so ably conducted. Previously there had been an inquiry for some clerical assistance; but when the larger business of the Canal shares had been completed, and the interests of England became more identified with Egypt, there was a greater necessity shown for the inquiry which followed. He could speak of his own knowledge that it was not the desire or at all the feeling of the Khedive to have mere clerks sent to him to look into his accounts. His Highness believed that Mr. Cave would report upon the affairs of Egypt, and the Khedive believed that the finances were sound and good at that time. The Khedive was not aware of the defective administration of his affairs, and His Highness had expressed to him (Sir George Elliot) over and over again his willingness to accord to any well-organized system for the administration of the affairs of Egypt his most cordial co-operation. With the permission of the House he would read a note which he himself had addressed to the Khedive. It was as follows :—

> "Two years ago His Excellency the Minister of Finance submitted to me, through Mr. Laing, then of the Imperial Ottoman Bank, a general statement of the Egyptian finance, and asked my opinion as to the best course to be taken for getting rid of the high interest then paid upon temporary loans, and the further accumulation of Debt. Since that time the subject has occupied much of my attention. On my arrival in Egypt in December last a suggestion was made to me by His Excellency the Minister of Finance as to the procuring of a loan of £2,000,000 on the security of the harbour revenues. I presumed on that occasion to express my conviction that any partial and temporary mode of dealing with the financial difficulties of the Government would be only to prolong a system which had already involved the country in general pecuniary embarrassments, and that some more comprehensive and effectual means should be adopted for re-adjusting the finances and restoring the credit of the Government."

He might say that the Report which he had published on Egyptian finance was prepared long before any Report was made by Mr. Cave; in fact, it was more than two years since he was invited by His Highness to look carefully into the financial condition of Egypt, and that occupied a considerable time. During his recent visit there he had his official accountants, Deloitte, Dever, Griffiths, and Co., and Ali Hassan, who was educated at King's College 25 years ago, and a most efficient and competent person, to assist in understanding the books and accounts; and after fully going into those matters it was remarkable that, although his inquiry had been commenced more than two years previously and was carried on entirely by independent means—not at the expense of either the English Government or of the Egyptian Government, but at his own cost—the statement of the general Debt of Egypt so nearly agreed with that of the right hon. Member for Shoreham. Indeed, there was not more than £1,000,000 difference between the two estimates. He thought that answered in a great measure the question that had been put—"What was the foundation of the correctness of the statements contained in Mr. Cave's Report?" For himself, he believed they were practically correct, and his opinion was that it would be well if such a change could be made as to the revenues that the Khedive should have his subsidy or civil list. As to the question whether the Mission of Mr. Cave had been of use or not, he believed that although attended with temporary inconvenience and hardship, because it had in a degree as it were precipitated the result, yet it had done good inasmuch as it had revealed plainly and clearly the condition of the finances of Egypt. It had perhaps, as he said, brought about a crisis earlier than it would have come; but the disaster resulting from it must be proportionately diminished because of the system of raising money to provide for the floating debt, which was constantly becoming due — almost every week, being raised at 20 and 25 per cent—was continued. It was not necessary to point out what must have been the inevitable consequence of such process. The inquiry had revealed the actual state of Egypt, which was not a forlorn one. It was sound so far as the income was calculated to deal with a fair payment of the Debts which were due from it. What he meant by that was giving fair and proper security, but with a reduced rate of interest, such as he proposed in his own scheme. By following out the scheme which he proposed to the Khedive, he had no doubt whatever that Egypt was equal to discharge all the interest for the sinking fund, which would relieve the Debt in 65 years, and there would be a margin sufficient for all the necessary requirements of the proper administration of the country. Having said so much, he returned to the most important part of the subject, which was this—That, in his opinion, it would be for the interest of Egypt, of the bondholders, and of England also, if the Government would give their moral countenance to Egypt. With an abundance of means, or, at any rate, with sufficient ans, to do all that he had said, it ld not avail unless there was proper ninistration; that was to say, due nomy in the discharge of the several ies of the State, proper functionaries ointed, and a responsibility attached he discharge of such duties, that the sons acting in such a position might assured that, if they did their duty, y would not undergo any kind of nace or chance of being discharged n their employment. He had a rough conviction that Egypt was nd in itself. Egypt had ample re- rces, which had increased and de- oped in the most extraordinary way, l had every appearance of doing so in ure. He believed that before that y twelvemonth the facts which had n stated would be more thoroughly ified, and the country would be in a ch better condition, both commer- lly and in every other respect in gher repute than it was at the present ment.

MR. DODSON begged to offer an ology to the right hon. Gentleman the mber for Shoreham (Mr. Stephen ve) for having called his Report waste per. When he said that the Report ich had been made was only waste per he referred to its scheme, which d proved unworkable.

MR. STEPHEN CAVE said, he had doubt the right hon. Gentleman used e words only in that sense, and was tisfied that nothing offensive to himself as meant.

INDIA—WAR OFFICE CHARGES.

RESOLUTION.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR, rising to move—

> "That it is inexpedient to consider any more stimates of this kind until it is satisfactorily roved by proper statements as to how the funds reviously advanced during the past five or six ears by the India Office on account of the ilitary charges defrayed by the War Office for ndia have been used by the Treasury, whether payment of War Office claims, or in swelling he Revenue of the kingdom,"

ointed out that when this money claim vas first before the House, he had en- leavoured to elicit information as to its letails, but as the discussion took place ong after 12 o'clock at night, there was o record, or at least a very defective report, of the matters discussed, and he could only repeat that a most objectionable course had been pursued towards India in reference to these charges, and especially in connection with what was called the unsettled account. Ever since 1870, when the rough-and-ready mode of settling the claims of the War Office against India for the military outlay at home by means of a capitation rate of £13 10*s*. per man in India being paid to the War Office to cover all expenses, was unwisely done away with, the War Office, in their annual balance sheet, had shown India to owe many hundreds of thousands of pounds, whereas she had actually paid up her debts, quarter by quarter as formerly, and was clear of debt to the War Office. It was not, therefore, right that India should be allowed to appear upon the accounts so deeply indebted to the Home Government as she did, the fact being, as he believed, that the India Office had paid direct to the Treasury the quarterly payments equal in amount to the former sums, but the Treasury appeared to have appropriated this money in order to swell the receipts of the Revenue—that was, instead of paying the War Office the expenses incurred for India, on account of Departments kept in England, the contributions from the India Office were dealt with as Revenue receipts, without any reference to the former liabilities borne by the War Office. This mode of enhancing the accounts of income of the United Kingdom was not done by the present Administration, but by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London; the question had been raised before the Public Accounts Committee, but it was left in a very unsatisfactory position, owing to the assertions of the Accountant General of the War Office being contradicted by the assertions of the Treasury officer, but having full confidence in the accuracy of the statement of the Accountant General, he preferred the statement of that officer, of the Treasury having kept back from the War Office the money due for military services for India which the India Office had paid over to the Treasury. The proper and best course in future would be for the India Office to receive from the War Office their bills of charges month by month, and let these two Departments settle the claims, and thus exclude the Treasury from their past kind of mischievous meddling with affairs which they had mismanaged.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is inexpedient to consider any more Estimates of this kind, until it is satisfactorily proved by proper statements as to how the funds previously advanced during the past five or six years by the India Office, on account of the Military charges defrayed by the War Office for India, have been used by the Treasury, whether in payment of War Office claims or in swelling the Revenue of the Kingdom,"—(*Sir George Balfour,*)

—instead thereof.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, that there was no doubt that India had defrayed the charges made upon her by the War Office, and the Public Accounts Committee had under consideration the form in which the accounts should in future be kept, and would report to the House next year on the subject.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £2,200, Mr. Cave's Mission to Egypt.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL thought that too sanguine a view had been taken of affairs in Egypt.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £9,200, Suez Canal, British Directors.

(3.) £129,922, to complete the sum for Public Buildings, Ireland.

(4.) £27,493, to complete the sum for the Privy Council Office.

(5.) £93,292, to complete the sum for Local Government Board, Ireland.

(6.) £10,098, to complete the sum for the National Gallery.

(7.) £12,400, to complete the sum for Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation.

Mr. RAMSAY complained that information as to the way in which this money was distributed had not been given, as was promised last year.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, that the matter had been thoroughly considered by a Committee, and there would be a Report upon the subject.

Vote *agreed to.*

(8.) £163,163, to complete the sum for Diplomatic Services.

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply to Sir H. Drummond Wolff, said, that the Treasury fully recognized the services which had been devoted to the preparation of the Hertslet collection of Treaties, and the Treasury would undertake the cost.

(9.) £184,896, to complete the sum for Consular Services.

(10.) £13,243, to complete the sum for Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland.

(11.) £3,476, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances, &c., Ireland.

(12.) £170,000, Charges defrayed by the War Office on account of India.

(13.) £3,500, Science and Art Department Buildings.

(14.) £15,000, Metropolitan Police Courts.

(15.) £2,545, Burlington House.

(16.) £4,900, Edinburgh Arboretum.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Class V.

(17.) £35,000, Supplementary sum for Grants in Aid of Expenditure in certain Colonies.

(18.) £29,101, Duke of Leeds' Pension Commutation.

(19.) £67,000, Supplementary sum for the Post Office.

(20.) £33,000, Supplementary sum for the Post Office Telegraphs.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported upon *Monday.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1874-5.

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [18th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5).

Question again proposed.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR stated that this important question of great excesses in the Naval expenditure over the sums voted by Parliament had been ably raised and clearly brought before the House by the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk), and as the debate was left incomplete, in order to allow of the First Lord of the Admiralty to be present, it was only necessary on this occasion to continue the subject by charging the Admiralty with having violated the Act of Parliament in largely exceeding in 11 of the Navy Votes the sums entered in the Estimate without the sanction of the House of Commons, and only a small excess with the sanction of the Treasury. On four Votes £42,900 had been exceeded with the sanction of the Treasury; but the sanction applied for by the Admiralty did not cover the excesses on these four Votes. On the seven other Votes the excesses were large, but no application of any kind was made to the Treasury for permission to exceed the sums voted by Parliament for the seven Votes or services. The words of the Appropriation Act appeared to be as full as could be necessary for the spending Departments to obtain the sanction of the Treasury before exceeding the amount voted by Parliament. The reading of that Act was not only clear, but positive as to the legal duties of the Navy and Army Departments—that they must keep within the Parliamentary limits of the money granted for the services, until the Treasury had allowed of an excess on the separate Votes. That allowance must be given before the liability was incurred by the Department. It was not consistent with the Act to obtain that sanction at the end of the year, but at the time, and before the debt, or liability was incurred; and the Treasury had no authority from Parliament to cover the debts or liabilities of either Army or Navy, by giving a covering letter of approval long after the liability had been created. The sanction must be given according to the Act before that liability, and it must be applied for by the Department immediately the necessity for incurring a liability arose, not after it had arisen. Then, again, the Treasury were strictly prohibited by the Appropriation Act from granting any permission to expend money in excess of the total sum voted on all the Votes for either Army or Navy. The excesses on any one of the several Votes of either Army or Navy must be met by the Treasury sanctioning only the savings or surpluses on some of the other Votes. Indeed, the regulations issued to give practical effect to the Appropriation Act appeared to limit the application of surpluses to meet deficiencies to the items of the several Votes, whereas the surplus on one of the Navy Votes had been used to meet the deficiency on another Vote, a practice open to grave objections. The greatest of all objections was the great liability incurred by the Admiralty not only without the sanction of Parliament, but without any report or application being made by the Admiralty to the Treasury. The next feature was the way the Admiralty had of late years brought in Supplementary Estimates, after submitting the year's Estimates to the House of Commons. This practice destroyed all comparisons, and if added to these excess Estimates, the Naval Administration also incurred liabilities or expended money beyond all these estimated sums, then, indeed, control by the House of Commons was impossible. And if such irregularities were to be condoned, it was impossible the Chancellor of the Exchequer could control the finances of the country. The gross irregularities of the Admiralty proved that there was something wrong which ought to be put a stop to with a high hand. If he were Chancellor of the Exchequer the First Lord of the Admiralty would not dare to attempt, and the Treasury would not sanction, what had been done.

MR. RAMSAY condemned the irregularities which had been admitted.

MR. HUNT said, the matter had been the subject of debate on two former occasions, when he himself made a statement at considerable length and expressed his dissatisfaction at what had been done. He had, however, when he came into office, to take up the Estimates of his Predecessor, who stated that he not been able to submit them to his own Cabinet. He would not dispute that there had been some irregularity, but in what he had done he had been in full and constant communication with the Secretary to the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He had expressed his dissatisfaction before, and would do so again, with the financial administration of the Admiralty; he had made fresh arrangements, and he hoped that these irregularities would not be complained of again.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Matter *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. W. H. SMITH moved—

(1.) That it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account, for the year ended 31st March 1875, that the balances unexpended in respect of certain Votes for Navy Services for the said year amounted to the sum of £83,574 0*s.* 7*d.*

(2.) That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application of the said sum of £83,574 0*s.* 7*d.* to provide in part for the expenditure incurred in excess of certain other Votes for Navy Services for the said year.

(3.) That the said application be sanctioned.

(4.) That it appears by the Army Appropriation Account, for the year ended 31st March 1875, that the balances unexpended in respect of certain Votes for Army Services for the said year amounted to the sum of £302,839 9*s.* 7*d.* and that the sum of £78,605 15*s.* 5*d.* has been realised in excess of the estimated Appropriations in aid; amounting together to the total sum of £381,445 5*s.*

(5.) That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application of £281,213 11*s.* out of the said total sum, to provide for the expenditure incurred in excess of certain other Votes for Army Services for the said year.

(6.) That the said application be sanctioned.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR who had on the Paper an Amendment, to move, to leave out after "7*d.*" in line 4 to end of line 9, in order to insert—

"2. That it appears by the same account that the expenditure in excess on certain other votes for the said year amounted to £419,733 19*s.*

"3. That, after applying the above surplus in diminution of the said excess, the Naval expenditure for the year 1874-5 is still in excess by £336,159 18*s.* 5*d.*

"4. That it appears that a part of this excess, amounting to £97,904 13*s.* 11*d.*, is chargeable to the expenses of the Ashantee expedition.

"5. That, after appropriating this sum out of the unexpended balance of the vote of credit granted by Parliament for the Ashantee expedition, the Naval expenditure for the year 1874-5 is still £238,255 4*s.* 6*d.* in excess of the aggregate sum appropriated by Parliament in the 37 and 38 Vic. c. 56, for the Naval Services, and that the same was incurred without the previous sanction of Parliament, and without all the excess being forthwith reported to the Treasury as the necessity arose.

"6. That Her Majesty's Commissioners of the Treasury are unable to lay before Parliament the statement of sanctions by the Treasury which sec. 4 of 37 and 38 Vic., c. 56, requires, to defray in part out of surpluses on some votes the expenditure on other votes in excess of the appropriations, consequent on the applications from the Naval Department for that authority not having been forthwith fully and duly made to the Treasury, as the Act requires, for all of the several excesses.

"7. That by the vote passed in this Session on the Supplementary Estimates of the Naval Department, dated 10th March, 1876, the sum of £238,255 4*s.* 6*d.* has been appropriated in defraying the portion of Naval expenditure which was incurred in 1874-5 in excess of the aggregate sum which Parliament appropriated by the Act 37 and 38 Vic., c. 56, for the Naval Services.

"8. That the said appropriations be sanctioned."

said, he feared his Resolutions would not meet with the acceptance of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member was informal, and not germane to the subject. Therefore it could not be submitted to the Committee.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR, while bowing to, but not accepting, the Chairman's ruling, declared the Resolutions, in the form they were submitted, were wholly without precedent. He declined, as an individual Member, to accept the Report of the Public Accounts Committee in a matter which was in itself illegal; and, with all respect to the Chair, he submitted that his own Resolutions were substantially in Order.

Mr. ANDERSON appealed to the Government not to take any Opposed Business.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, it was not intended to do so, but it was necessary to get this Vote in order to lay the foundation for the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. W. H. SMITH justified the course pursued by the Treasury, which he contended was in strict accordance with precedent, and assured the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Kincardine (Sir George Balfour) that the Resolutions now submitted to the Committee were framed in compliance with the Appropriation Act.

Motion *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported upon *Monday.*

MUNICIPAL PRIVILEGES (IRELAND) BILL.—[Bill 39.]

Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Butt, Mr. Ronayne.)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Sir ARTHUR GUINNESS, in moving the following clause:—

> ("Persons to be excluded from being sheriff or honorary burgesses.)
>
> "No person who has been convicted of felony, or any misdemeanour, shall be capable of being elected as high sheriff or to the rank of honorary burgess,"

said, it was not necessary that he should enter into arguments on the subject. He would only remark that it had been found necessary to introduce a similar clause into the Poor Law Act.

New clause (Persons to be excluded from being sheriffs or honorary burgesses,)—(*Sir Arthur Guinness,*)—*brought up,* and read a first time.

On Question, "That the clause be now read a second time?"

Mr. GIBSON said, he believed the hon and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) had something to say with regard to the clause. The objection taken was as to the nature of the misdemeanour that ought to bar the appointment. He should therefore advise his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Dublin (Sir Arthur Guinness) to make his clause run to the effect that no person convicted of felony should be capable of being elected. With that modification he thought the Motion was free from the objection suggested. He would accordingly move an Amendment that the proposed clause be amended by leaving out the words "or any misdemeanour.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On the Motion of Mr. Gibson, clause further *amended,* by striking out the words "as high sheriff or."

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, read a second time, and *added* to the Bill.

Mr. GIBSON (for Mr. I. T. Hamilton), proposed to move the following clause:—

> "(On failure of town council to appoint, the Lord Lieutenant may appoint a sheriff.)
>
> "In case any of the said town councils shall neglect or refuse to appoint a fit person to be sheriff on the day, or within the time, and in manner provided by this Act, it shall be lawful for the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, at any time before the thirtieth day of November then next ensuing, to appoint a fit person to be such sheriff; and every person so appointed shall have and exercise all the powers, privileges, and duties pertaining to a sheriff appointed by a town council under this Act."

On objection being taken—

Mr. SPEAKER ruled that the clause could not be moved in the absence of the hon. Member for the county of Dublin (Mr. I. T. Hamilton).

Sir ARTHUR GUINNESS moved as an Amendment, in Clause 3, page 2, line 2, to leave out "appoint a fit person," and insert—

> "Select three persons qualified to fill the said office of sheriff, and shall within fourteen days thereafter, notify to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland the names of the persons so selected, arranged in alphabetical order, and the Lord Lieutenant shall, within seven days from the receipt by him of such notification, appoint one of the persons so selected."

Mr. M. BROOKS moved to amend the proposed Amendment by leaving out the words "arranged in alphabetical order."

Amendment amended, and *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. Gibson, clause further *amended,* by leaving out in page 2, line 7, "in manner hereinafter mentioned;" and in page 2, line 8, by inserting after "oaths," the word "now."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Sir ARTHUR GUINNESS moved, as an Amendment, in Clause 4, page 2, line 14, to leave out the words after "respectively," and insert—

> "Select three persons qualified to fill the said office of sheriff, and shall, within fourteen days thereafter, notify to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland the names of the persons so selected, arranged in alphabetical order, and the Lord Lieutenant shall, within seven days from the receipt by him of such notification, appoint one of the persons so selected to be sheriff."

Mr. M. BROOKS moved the omission in the proposed Amendment of the words "arranged in alphabetical order."

Mr. BUTT said, that the English law on the same subject was that the corporation had the absolute nomination of the sheriff. That was obtained by an Act passed in 1871, which was adopted on the Report of a Select Committee; and now it was proposed that the Lord Lieutenant was to have the final selection of the sheriff. Although objecting to it, they had made up their minds that it was not worth while opposing it.

Amendment amended, and *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Sir ARTHUR GUINNESS moved, as an Amendment, in Clause 8, page 3, line 8, to leave out the whole of the clause after the word "may or" in line 8, and insert—

> "Select three persons qualified to fill the said vacancy, and shall, within seven days thereafter, notify to the Lord Lieutenant the names of the persons so selected, arranged in alphabetical order, and the Lord Lieutenant shall, within seven days from the receipt by him of such notification, appoint one of the persons so selected to fill the said vacancy, or to be in the room of the persons so refusing, superseded, dying, or becoming incapable."

Mr. M. BROOKS moved to amend the proposed Amendment by omitting the words relating to alphabetical order.

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Mr. GIBSON then moved, as an Amendment, in Clause 12, after the word "privilege" in line 42, "or to be elected to any corporate office."

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 42, after the word "privilege," to insert the words "or to be elected to any corporate office."—(*Mr. Gibson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. BUTT said, they could not agree to that.

Captain NOLAN said, it would be very unfortunate if the Bill did not pass. The Forms of the House had prevented them having a full discussion of the Bill; but if it were not passed now, it would lead to great irritation in Ireland, not on account of the Bill itself, but of the manner in which Irish Business was conducted in Parliament.

Mr. GIBSON observed, that the Notices had been on the Paper for the last two months; but if there was any misconception on the subject, the consideration of the matter could be adjourned.

Mr. M. BROOKS said, he did not attach the importance to the matter which the hon. Gentleman seemed to do.

Further Proceeding adjourned till *Monday.*

CHAIRMEN'S JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Plunket) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Laws relating to the jurisdiction of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions in Ireland.

Captain NOLAN opposed the Motion on behalf of the hon. Member for Dundalk (Mr. Callan), and complained that no explanation whatever had been given to the House on the subject.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Plunket) stated that the Bill was merely a suspensory Bill, making provision for the discharge of the duties of chairman in counties in which vacancies occurred.

Captain NOLAN observed, that they ought to have some guarantee that the Bill was only for one year.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill to amend the Laws relating to the jurisdiction of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 286.]

JURIES (DUBLIN) BILL.

LEAVE.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Plunket) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Laws with respect to Juries in the county and the county of the city of Dublin.

Mr. BUTT said, that the Bill proposed to accomplish, by a separate measure, what had been given up by the Juries Procedure Bill, and it was too important a measure to be brought in at the end of the Session.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR RELAND (Mr. PLUNKET) said, it was e general clauses somewhat similar the provisions of this local measure d appeared in the Juries Procedure ll, proposed with the intention of carry- g out the Report of a Committee unded on the evidence taken in favour the suggestion. Great opposition d been offered to the proposal, how- er, on the part of the hon. and learned ember for Limerick, and he thought so on that of the hon. Member for rogheda; and it was then deemed the etter course to withdraw the clauses fecting the country generally, and to troduce a new Bill dealing only with the unty of Dublin and the county of the ty of Dublin, as to which he believed ere was unanimity of feeling. The Bill ad the support of both hon. Members r the county and for the city of Dublin, ho had ascertained the wishes of their onstituents on the subject. It had been ressed very earnestly on the Govern- ent, and the Government desired to se no time in passing it, if possible, uring the present Session of Parlia- ent. They had been strongly urged to o so, among other public bodies by the hamber of Commerce, and by large umbers of individuals. If, however, e hon. and learned Member was re- olved, on his own responsibility, to de- eat the measure, and was prepared to ppose it at that stage, there was little ope of passing it so late in the year; nder these circumstances, he should not ppose an Adjournment of the Debate f it was moved for.

Motion made, and Question proposed, ‘ That the Debate be now adjourned,” —(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—put, and *greed to.*

Debate adjourned till *Monday.*

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1877, the sum of £28,703,043 be granted, out of he Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday.*

House adjourned at Nine o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 7th August, 1876.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*— Elementary Education* (204); Pollution of Rivers* (207).

Second Reading — Cattle Disease (Ireland) (195); Savings Banks (Barrister)* (198); Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates)* (199); Bishopric of Truro (201); Erne Lough and River (189); Ardglass Harbour (193).

Committee—Juries Procedure (Ireland)* (196).

Committee—Report—Poor Law Rating (Ireland)* (197).

Third Reading — Winter Assizes (Ireland)* (200), and *passed.*

CATTLE DISEASE (IRELAND) BILL.

(*The Lord President.*)

(NO. 195.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, the measure was one which affected very materially both Ireland and this country. In England the law was that animals were slaughtered compulsorily which were suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, and the person who owned the animals was compensated by the local authorities who were stationed in various parts of the country. The local authorities in England who performed those duties were composed of magistrates of quarter sessions, but in Ireland there was no local authority formed in the various districts of the country, the local authority being the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council in Dublin. It was found that mischievous results arose from there being no local authority, because cases often occurred in which the compulsory slaughter of animals suffering from disease was not ordered. In fact, there was in Ireland no compulsory slaughter. Her Majesty's Government had thought that such a state of things as this ought not to be allowed to remain, and had therefore introduced the present Bill for the purpose of affording a remedy. The object of the Bill was to enable the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to confer on the Boards of Guardians throughout the country, some of the powers which he now exercised absolutely, to make arrangements for preventing the spread of disease amongst sheep, cattle, and horses—horses being now included for the first time under the term "animals." Boards of Guardians had no power to make any such regulations under the existing law. The powers proposed to be conferred included the appointment of Inspectors, and the appointment of Valuers; and the latter part of Clause 4 provided that in maritime ports, the appointment of Inspectors should be under different provisions from those under which Inspectors were appointed in the other parts of the country, and that such Inspectors should be under the power of the Lord Lieutenant. The Boards of Guardians were to compensate the persons whose animals were slaughtered under the Act, a portion of the compensation being paid out of the "Cattle Plague Fund." The 15th clause enabled the Lord Lieutenant to frame Orders and take the execution of the Act into his own hands. He did not know that there were any other matters to which he need call attention. He believed that the Bill would be a very useful measure, and if it passed into law it would afford a proper and sufficient staff of Inspectors in Ireland, so as to prevent the importation into this country of diseased animals. That would be beneficial to both countries, because agriculturists in this country knew very well that we were indebted to Ireland for a large portion of the stock imported into England. The noble Duke concluded by moving the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord President.*)

Lord EMLY thoroughly agreed with the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon) that there was a necessity for introducing some measure dealing with the subject, and trusted that the effect of the Bill would be to get rid of the various complaints of which they had all heard so much with regard to the importation of disease into this country. But he confessed that it appeared to him that the mode in which the object was to be arrived at did not seem to be a wise or desirable one. In England a great deal of power for preventing the spread of cattle disease was given to the local authorities. In Ireland the system was a centralized one, and was worked by the Government through Inspectors. He attached great importance to the carrying out of the recommendations of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, of which Committee he had been a Member. That Committee was appointed to consider whether the law in Ireland as to the treatment of animals infected with disease should be assimilated to that in England. The general opinion of the Committee was that the Irish system, a centralized one, was better than the English system, which consisted in giving a great deal of power to the local authorities; that it worked more satisfactorily, and all it wanted to make it perfect was to place at the disposal of the Veterinary Department a larger number of Inspectors. This Bill introduced to a large extent the English system into Ireland. He was convinced, however, that the duty entrusted to Boards of Guardians would not be discharged by them nearly as efficiently as if it were left to the Veterinary Department, and he suggested that the existing system in Ireland should be preserved. He was afraid the mode proposed would give rise to a great deal of jobbery.

Earl SPENCER approved of the Bill, as he knew well the great importance both to England and to Ireland that Irish cattle should be kept in a satisfactory sanitary state. He had always urged that the same regulations should be enforced in both countries, and during the time he was in Ireland the orders respecting the Cattle Plague were made more stringent. Against that increased stringency there was a strong feeling; but he had always maintained that, if owners of cattle in Ireland would not submit to proper regulations for preventing the spread of disease, they need not be surprised if in England stringent measures were taken with regard to the importation of Irish cattle. He was, therefore, glad to see a measure which was founded upon the Report of the Committee of 1873. When in Ireland he thought the same Orders should be enforced there as in England; but the Law Officers declared that there was no power to levy a compensation rate for the purposes required, and Ireland was therefore left under a different law. He trusted the Bill would be the means of doing great good both in Ireland and in this country. We could not rely wholly the Board of Inspection, but we must rry into effect stringent orders, as they re carried into effect in England for e extermination of this fatal disease nong cattle. Unless power were given the local authorities to act at once, nsiderable delay would arise before e cattle in an affected district could be stroyed, and during which the disease ould spread. It was of no use waiting r their machinery to be ready before king action for the repression of sease, and he therefore thought that Committee some Amendment should e made in order to give a still more eedy operation to the measure. He ould see no objection to the Lord Lieuenant having power to constitute those ifferent parts of the country in which he local authorities should be made immediately aware of the outbreak of isease.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee f the Whole House *To-morrow.*

BISHOPRIC OF TRURO BILL.—(No 201.)

(*The Lord President.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was a very important Bill, affecting a considerable portion of the western part of the diocese of Exeter. Their Lordships would not have forgotten the statement which the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of that diocese made at an earlier part of the Session as to the enormous amount of duty which devolved upon him and the impossibility of properly discharging it. The right rev. Prelate had shown in an unmistakeable and a liberal manner that he was prepared to assist in carrying into effect the alteration of his diocese. The circumstance of Lady Rolle having set apart £1,200 per annum for the purpose of forming a new Bishopric of Truro was the reason why this Bill had been introduced. That sum, together with the amount which the Bishop of Exeter had consented to give out of his revenues, would enable the Bishopric to be formed. He thought there could be no objection to carrying into effect the liberal ideas manifested by Lady Rolle, and, therefore, he now moved the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord President.*)

The Bishop of EXETER desired to express his gratitude to the Government for having brought in the Bill. As the measure was not to come into operation until a sufficient endowment was provided, he hoped no long period would elapse before sufficient provision was made for the purpose. He could assure their Lordships that a division of the diocese was necessary for the due discharge of the duties of it. Those duties were far too large to be satisfactorily performed by the same person.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

ARMY — THE RESERVES.

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS.

Lord STRATHNAIRN: My Lords, your Lordships have given such constant proof of useful interest in the Army that I do not apologize for soliciting deferentially, but earnestly, your Lordships' attention to a military subject, always very important, but especially so in present times, when the best guarantees of honourable peace and of the safety of British policy and engagements are an efficient Army and Navy. The subject is the inherent defect in the organization of the two Army Reserves, liable to serve abroad, which, for the sake of clearness, and because they cannot exist without civil employment, I call Civil Employment Reserves. The senior of them is the First Class of the Army Reserve which was formed in 1867; but as it is now in a state of extinction, numbering only 53 men, I shall make no further mention of it, except historically, and to observe that the Minister of War in 1870 induced nearly 2,400 of its men by a bounty of a guinea, in spite of his denunciations of the evils of bounty, to volunteer for the First Class Army Reserve which he was then organizing. The Second Class of the Army Reserve of 1867 are the pensioners who do not serve abroad. They are good and experienced soldiers, about 14,000 strong, serving under the salutary influence of pension, that best incentive to good conduct. The Irish pensioners, in spite of the efforts of disaffected countrymen to seduce them from their duty, did faithful service under me during five years of Irish agitation for a red Republic, a favourable result which it would be a delusion, as I shall show, to expect from the Irish soldiers of the First Class Army Reserve, raised in 1870, serving without pension in the Irish districts. This, the First Class Army Reserve, is, since the collapse of the First Class of the Army Reserve of 1867, the only one liable to serve abroad. It was formed on the conditions of service of the Army Enlistment Act of 1870, which state, in its Preamble, that the object of the Act is to shorten the period of Army service, and to establish a Reserve Force which may be called into active service in a period of emergency. The War Office Regulations of 9th February, 1871, state more explicitly the very important duties and obligations of the First Class Army Reserve—

> "That they may be called out on permanent service by Proclamations in a great emergency, or in times of imminent national peril; that they then become liable to general service with the Army; that whenever the Force is called out for training, or in aid of the Civil Power, and for exercise, all the provisions of the Mutiny Act and Articles of War apply to them."

For the proper appreciation of this subject it should be borne in mind that the organization of the two Civil Employment Reserves is based on an untried theory, the policy of a great military economy to save the greater part of the expense of their pay and allowances by means of the civil employment of the men of the Reserves. It is reasoned in favour of this system that it is a copy of the Prussian. But that is a perversion of the plainest reason, and of the simplest logic. For with the exception of both being short service, the two systems are as different as it is possible to be; the copy does not possess one feature of the original, the Prussian being rigid, despotic conscription; the English, constitutional, voluntary service, so voluntary, that, 24 hours after a recruit has engaged, he may declare off, should he think better of it. It follows that the organizations of Prussian and English Reserves are as different as compulsion and free-will can make them, a fact so palpable that one out of a series of examples is sufficient to prove it. The pay and allowances of the English Reserves, for it is needless to observe that no Englishman would serve voluntarily in an unpaid Reserve is a difficulty which three successive Ministers of War have been unable to overcome. They cannot, as their own official acts prove, reconcile the jarring interests of the civil employés of the Reserve soldier of economy and of the rights of the country to an efficient Reserve for its protection. But the Prussian *sic volo sic jubeo* system passes over all these obstacles at once by giving their Reserves no pay, no allowances, except during their training, which their very severe, but perfect drill, does not require to be so long or frequent as English Reserve training; which brings to light another important difference between the two services—that is, that if Prussian drill were introduced into the English Army, the service would become unpopular; and recruiting would at once fall off; our Reserves, therefore, to be efficient, require more drill than the Prussian. I now beg to submit to your Lordships a brief history, official facts, of the two Civil Employment Reserves of 1867 and 1870, which shows that their payment by civil employment is incompatible with the welfare of their soldiers, and the training and discipline of war Reserves, whose duty it is to protect this country and its vast interests in great emergencies and imminent national peril. Your Lordships will see the varied difficulties against which the Reserve soldier has to contend in obtaining civil employment or work. They commence with the fundamental one, that, as a rule, the civil employer would prefer the non-military workman, whose time and service are exclusively at his disposal, and not curtailed and interrupted, as is the case with the Reserve workman, by his military duties and obligations. Your Lordships' will learn from official documents the sacrifices which have been made of training, discipline and finance, to remove or modify the causes of unwillingness of the civilian to employ the Reserve man, and of the Reserve man to enter the Reserve, of which the daily pay is insufficient, and civil employment too precarious, to ensure him the means of existence. With the view of remedying these two causes of the unsuccessful working of the system, from 1867 to

76, the War Office in 1870 doubled
daily pay given in 1867 to the Re-
ve, and trebled it in 1876. Having
is increased considerably the financial
rdens of the country to remedy the want
d uncertainty of civil employment, the
ar Office reduced in large proportions
amount of training considered neces-
y for the Reserve in 1867, because it in-
fered with and prevented the Reserve
diers getting civil employment. These
ditional heavy charges in the Army
timates for a Reserve, whose charac-
istic was to be its economy, and the
ge curtailments of its instruction were
companied by other measures affect-
g discipline, as well as drill, to prop
a system, whose organic defects can-
t fail to bring about its fall. To make
e Reserve popular, and to make up,
ll further, for the uncertainty of civil
rk, the late Minister of War, although
had strongly condemned, in Parlia-
ent, bounty, and abolished it on ac-
unt of its bad effects on discipline,
rmitted the Reserve to receive on the
st day of each quarter three months'
y in advance, which is the same as
ounty, and even worse, as will be
own in its effect on the Reserve
ldier. This concession was followed
two others, equally impolitic, to the
vil employer and the Reserve man—
e first, exemption of the Reserve, as a
ody, from training, under the Mutiny
ct and Articles of War; and the other,
xemption of individual Reserve soldiers
om training in Government, or respon-
ble employment of a higher class. It is
ifficult to say which of these two exemp-
ons is the most regretable, in the in-
rests of discipline, military instruction,
nd the fair and impartial allotment of
e soldier's duties, which is one of the
ost important features of the Queen's
egulations. After this preface, my
ords, I beg to pass to the history of
he Reserves of 1867 and 1870. So
ominant was the spirit of economy, and
o great the hopes of civil employment
or the soldiers of the Reserve, that the
overnment, when they formed the First
lass of the Army Reserve in 1867, only
ave its men 2*d.* daily pay each, which
s a small fraction of the pay and al-
owances which they had in their regi-
ments, leaving it to them to obtain the
difference by civil employment—that is,
wages for work, from the Government
downwards to the lowest class of civil
employer. This Reserve is erroneously called General Peel's; but that successful Minister of War, who united useful military experience with administrative ability, disapproved the system, and proposed a different one. The responsible military authorities in 1867 fixed the training of the Reserve at 28 days' drill with the Militia, and 12 days under Staff serjeants of pensioners. But this amount of training brought into play the jarring interests which I have mentioned. The civil employer would not take into his service a man whose work was to be interrupted every year by 40 days of military training and duties. And, on the other hand, the Reserve soldier could not live on his daily pay, which was only 2*d.* The Reserve of 1867 therefore broke down, as will be seen in 1870. The unwillingness of civilians to employ Reserve men is grounded on the strongest of motives—self interest. For, in the first place, there is the inherent disadvantage already alluded to, which, in other words, is simply that the Reserve workman serves two masters—one, himself; the other, the real master, the Reserve soldier's military superior. It is waste of time to add that, as a rule, the civilian must prefer a civilian workman, of whom he is the sole master. In the second place, a call to arms or to training of the Reserve men engaged in the very varied work of this country—from steam, gas, and iron, to agricultural, prison, or railway work—interrupts, and is prejudicial to that order and system which are indispensable for its success. The better the workman, the greater the loss; and an unexperienced substitute may derange or blow up a gas work, let loose convicts, turn a break, or shunt a railway carriage the wrong way. I now beg to adduce difficulties; the Reserve man has to encounter, in obtaining civil employment or work sufficient for a livelihood, much more an equivalent to his liberal, regimental pay and allowances, which cannot amount to less than 2*s.* 6*d.* or 3*s.* a-day. The Reserve soldier starts with a natural difficulty in obtaining such wages by work, or anything like them, for the combatant or enterprizing spirit of the village or manufacturing town, whose distaste for labour has led him to enlist, is not the man to settle down to hard work. But, besides this drawback, he has to struggle with the constant

fluctuations of the labour market, bad times, the influence of strikes and trades unions. If he fall sick, and sickness is another and a very serious shortcoming of the First Class Army Reserve, he has no regimental hospital to go to; or, if his work stop, he has to face daily accumulating debt and destitution. It is apposite to state here a few facts as to the absence of organization in the First Class Army Reserve. They are not subject to the provisions of the Mutiny Act and Articles of War, except when called out on emergency and national peril, for training, or exercise, or drill, or aid, to the civil power; they have no regimental or hospital organization; three months' anticipated Reserve pay; and a roving pass from muster day to muster day. They are allowed an uniform, necessaries, and liberal pay, when called out. Anticipated pay, bounty and deferred pay—all three are similar in their effects. Pandora's gift; the lump sum of money in hand—that fatal temptation to the lower classes—the great field of British recruiting — to indulge, to an extent before unknown to them, the popular passion—drink, which the history of our naval and military law proves to be the chief cause of the crimes and misfortunes of these classes. Of the three evils, bounty is the least, because whilst in a voluntary service, such as ours, it is, and always will be, a successful attraction to enlist; the disorders to which it gives rise, because, under the control of regimental authorities, from the lance corporal to the commanding officer, are easier checked and have fewer bad consequences than anticipated pay and deferred pay, which are under no military restraint. It was, therefore, with unaffected regret that officers of experience learnt that deferred pay was to be given, for the sake of not a great economy, in lieu of the soldier's pension, that great incentive to good conduct, which gives the deserving soldier with long service, a happy, because however humble, an independent home amongst kith and kin, and which he values still more because he looks on it as a reward granted him for long and faithful service by a grateful Sovereign and generous country, which saves him from the dependence, the cold comfort, and the isolation of the workhouse. I was instructed, in the spiring of 1870 by the War Office, to state the cause of the collapse of the First Class of the Army Reserve of 1867, arising from the unwillingness of soldiers to enter it—I referred the case, for their opinions, to selected commanding officers of regiments in Ireland. Their report re-echoed briefly the causes stated in this speech: insufficient pay of the soldiers of the Reserve, and want of civil employment, to enable them to make up for their insufficient pay by work. I approved this opinion, and submitted it to the Secretary of State for War, who confirmed it, and acknowledged the correctness of the Report as to the two deficiencies which had caused the collapse of the Reserve—too little pay, and want of civil employment—by introducing into the Army Enlistment Act of 1870, which established the First Class Army Reserve, provisions which doubled the pay of its soldiers, and abolished, with the view of rendering Reserve workmen acceptable to the civil employer, the 28 days' training with the Militia, which left it with only 12 days' annual training under Staff serjeants of pensioners. But these concessions did not produce the desired effect, for in 1876 the War Office found it necessary to amplify them, and increase the pay of the Reserve men to 6*d*., and, at the same time, to further reduce the training to seven days in the year. It is to be regretted that the War Department, in their eagerness to make the system of civil employment Reserves succeed, should not have submitted to Parliament the difficulties which they had encountered in working this, as I have ventured to say, untried theory; more especially as the increase of Reserve pay, and abolition of the training of the Reserve with the Militia, enacted in the Army Enlistment Act of 1870, had not caused the system to work satisfactorily. If Parliament had been consulted, the War Office would not have had recourse to expedients which affected discipline, training, and the rules of the Service. I have some right, my Lords, to make the mention I have done of that regret, because in June, 1871, I expressed in debate "my great regret" that the War Office had in 1870 been silent and kept your Lordships in the dark as to the War Office having, in consequence of a Report from the commanding officers of regiments in Ireland, confirmed by myself, as to the causes of the collapse of the Reserve of 1867, that is—insufficiency pay and want of civil employment, reased the pay of the Reserve to 4*d*., ch increase they had stated to Par- nent, but had been silent as to the uction of their 28 days training with t Militia, and the difficulties occa- ied by civil employment. If your dships had been thus made ac- inted in 1870 with the inherent diffi- ies and unfavourable consequences the civil employment system with sequent curtailment of a great part of training, you would, with your habi- l care for the public interests, have ad- d the adoption of remedial measures ch would not have increased since that e the Army Estimates, whilst they inished the efficiency of the training he Reserve and compromised the in- sts of discipline. And, certainly, Lords, nothing could prejudice the rests of training and discipline more n the two expedients to reconcile the l employer to the Reserve workman, l I must observe that curtailment of ll is also agreeable to him. Both of se expedients were resorted to also hout being previously communicated Parliament by the War Office after concessions of 1870. The first these two expedients was the mis- sion by the late Secretary of State War of his own Regulations of bruary 9, 1871, that whenever the serve was called out for training it s to be under the provisions of the tiny Act and the Articles of War. e War Office ignored this Regulation, d allowed the training to be volun- y, that is—at the will of the Reserve dier. The results of taking out of hands of the military superiors duty of instructing the soldiers and ving it in their hands, a policy un- own in the civilized armies of the rld, was a reversal of all the positions authority and subordination. The neral officer commanding in Ire- d and other officers in command had solicit and invite, when they ought to ve commanded, the attendance of diers at training. The good or un- ployed soldier complied; but the one th good employment or the bad soldier, t excuses or, as Lord Sandhurst said, pertinent refusals; and it was another favourable symptom that the Reserve n who attended were in a very small nority. The training was neglected several years, and the Reserve was taught in the valuable A B C of the modern art of war—skirmishing with proper precautions—the knowledge and use of ground against the improved arms of the present day—which would have been so useful to them if called to take the field against Continental troops. The unfavourable result of allowing the soldier's knowledge of his duty to be optional with him caused the discontinuance, as I was informed by the Under Secretary of State, when I asked for the defaulters lists of the Reserve of the annual training of the Reserves at their district-place of assembly, under the wholesome influence of military law, where their military spirit was kept up, and acts of undiscipline such as absences were registered and punished—the soldiers equipped in their uniforms were practised in drill and in marching in their new ammunition boots, a military precaution against foot-soreness, which, however little thought of by civilians, has, when neglected, caused disasters ensuing from a tardy march or a delayed concentration. The noble Earl stated that there were no defaulters lists, because the Reserves had not been assembled at their district places for training. The other exemption was of Reserve men with responsible employment of a higher class — generally, Government employment—such as gaols, &c. These exemptions were, I understand, very numerous — I speak under correction, as the War Department has not given me the promised Returns — and so completely freed them from their military duties that they did not even attend the important concentrations of the Second and Fifth Army Corps. This second exemption—I do not know whether it was allowed by the late or present Minister of War — is not so serious as the first; but it is a departure from that equitable distribution of the soldier's duties, which is an essential guarantee of his contentment and discipline. The excusing a comrade and an equal from common duties excites jealousies and unfavourable feelings in a Force. And it is a bad example that military instruction which is an imperative duty, and without which a soldier is useless, should be allowed to be entirely superseded by the duties of civil employment. It is due to the present Secretary of State for War to state here how much the Army is indebted to him for having at the late concentrations assembled the First Class Army Reserve at their different destinations under the provisions of the Mutiny Act and Articles of War. But even these really fatal exemptions could not render satisfactory the working of the unfortunate system of civil employment, for, as I have stated, the pay in 1876 was raised to 6*d.*, and the 12 days' training reduced to 7. It is remarkable that although such sweeping and numerous concessions were made to the civil employer and the Reserve soldier, not only none were granted to the taxpayer, but each concession to them was accompanied by an additional tax, so that in this year he has to pay treble for a Reserve proportionately diminished in value as his protection in times of great emergency and imminent national peril. I shared the general satisfaction expressed at the creditable and military appearance and set-up of the First Class Army Reserve at the concentrations of the two Army Corps in July last, as well as at their good conduct, their knowledge of elementary drill, and the correctness and steadiness with which they performed the movements; I speak from hearsay. But it is only just to the case to add that these movements were very simple, that a bugle was not heard, skirmishing was not practised, although now, on account of improved arms, so important an instruction. And as regards their conduct it is equally fair to the case to say that is confidently stated that the small percentage of men absent from the Reserve would have been much larger, if old illegal absences struck off the strength of the Reserve had been entered in the state; and no merit can be claimed for men not absenting themselves when they were exempted from all their duties and got all their pay: that at exercises with other troops, commanding officers had been anything but satisfied with their conduct; and that in two instances on the march to and from the July concentrations, parties of the Reserve had misconducted themselves; and certainly Lord Sandhurst's opinion of them when commanding in Ireland was anything but favourable of them. The concentrations were a *fête*, and cannot be considered as a criterion of the Force. The weather was beautiful; the Reserve men wore their new clothes, received extra pay for the concentration; the employers, considering it a holiday, gave their Reserve workmen leave for seven days. Still, they would not give them another day, although it was for the march past. Crowds came from London and all parts to see these *gala* parades. But it is impossible to blind oneself to the fact that a call to arms of the First Class Army Reserve under very different circumstances would have produced very different results, such as a call in bitter winter weather for aid for an indefinite time to the Civil Power in Ireland or foreign service, with no leave from the civil employer, but, on the contrary, the certainty that they would find their places filled should they return. And I venture to ask, what would be the course pursued by the Reserve soldiers with comfortable homes and well-paid employments, with the prospect of nothing but daily pay, rigid performance of their duties in tents, 12 men to a tent, or a bivouac with all the hardships of a campaign? The most important feature of the concentration of the First Class Army Reserve remains to be told. But before doing so, it is necessary for the better comprehension of the great military question with which it is connected to take a glance at the past—the events and speeches of 1870-71. With reference to those times, the Secretary of State in February, 1871, was pleased to say that—

> "Events had occurred in Europe of so marvellous a character that 'he thought it no exaggeration to say they had no parallel in the records of history or in the fables of Herodotus;'"

and added that the influence of these events had

> "created the fixed determination in the minds of the British people to place their military establishments on an efficient footing, and to have an Army with Reserves."

After reading that speech it will be for your Lordships to judge whether the Militia regiments and their Reserves, so much eulogized by competent judges at the concentrations in July last, are not entitled to less doubtful praise than the noble Viscount bestowed on them at that time; whether the short service which he said lay at the root of all Army reform and its offspring "a special Reserve" as he called it, for the formation of both of which, he says, he introduced a Bill into Parliament in 1870 have justified the noble Viscount's high eulogium of them and the expectation

ch he formed of their success; and
ether the hope expressed by him has
n fulfilled, that he would get, by
ans of the short service, 9,000 men
the First Class Army Reserve, for
ch number he had charged in the
ny Estimates; and finally, whether
was right in stating that he "con-
ered himself entitled to adhere to and
tain the policy of attenuated regi-
nts in the time of peace." The im-
tant feature of the First Class Army
serve was the misapprehension, I be-
re, a general one, that that Reserve
s a short-service one—whereas on the
trary it was a long-service one and
nposed of old soldiers, too old some of
m for a campaign. The importance
this fact is the consideration to which
gives rise respecting the causes why
from being a short-service Reserve,
short-service men served, notwith-
nding the predictions of the noble
scount which I have quoted, that he
ıld get 9,000 men by means of the
ort service; and notwithstanding that
the short-service men who had served
e three years since 1870, which the
h paragraph of the Army Enlistment
t of 1870 allowed them to do, for the
press purpose of forming a Reserve,
ich the Preamble of that Bill and the
ar Minister stated was the object of
e Bill—more than 9,000 men would
ve entered the Reserve by this time.
e conclusion to be drawn from this is
at these men must have been used for
her purposes than that of the Reserves,
d that purpose could only have been
fill up the vacancies in regiments em-
rking for India and abroad, which
ere below their strength, and to fill up
cancies in them caused by the medical
thorities rejecting as unfit for foreign
rvice, on account of their bad physique
nder age, or other causes required to
ay at home. A War Office Return
ows that the First Class Army Reserve,
e only Army Reserve liable to serve
broad, consisted of long-service men
nd numbered about 5,300 in July last.
he late Minister of War's predictions
ll to the ground, therefore, that he
ould get 9,000 short-service men for
he Reserves, who were to make up for
is policy of attenuated regiments, to
hich, on account of the certainty of
aving the "Special Reserve," he
teadily adhered. All the Reports of
uccessive Inspector Generals, however
nuch they may speak in favour of recruiting, admit the absence of the men of height and bodily strength who formerly enlisted, and that a great proportion of the recruits of the present day require what is called fattening up for a year or two. It is notorious that the great numbers of the recruits since short service was established are under age. The Artillery Guards who require men of a better physique are short of their strength. Under these circumstances it is clear that short service without pension does not enable recruiting to compete so successfully as formerly in the "labour market." Under the influence of these considerations, I consider it my duty to say that the Government is as little able at the present time to send an Army on foreign service as they were in 1874, when the rights of the Treaty of Paris were surrendered to the illegitimate demands of Russia, which was as much opposed to Treaty as to International Law; that it was at least a satisfaction to know that a surrender of those rights which no Englishman could hear mentioned without a flush of the cheek and a sigh, the friends I had in the late Cabinet had yielded a great British right—which they must have loathed to do as much as their countrymen—through the pressure of the want of military means of going to war should Russia have persisted in her demands, which, however, there is no doubt she never intended to do. I have had the honour to submit to your Lordships the opinion founded on the state of Ireland for centuries, and the want of regimental organization, regular pay, and military control of the First Class Army Reserve, and the numerous causes which I have stated in this speech affecting the efficiency of the Reserves—that they are useless in England, and dangerous in Ireland; which opinion, serious as it is, was not controverted by any Member on either side of your Lordships' House. It would, therefore, be waste of time to enlarge on the subject. As regards India, my Lords, short service is a failure; so say all the best military and financial authorities, and a Committee sat lately on this subject, which proves that Indian feeling, as well as of a great party in this country, on this subject is favourable to the Indian view of the question. It was urged by former Committees that this country was put to a great expense in instructing and preparing troops to serve in India, and

that this ought to be a set-off to the great expense which the short service caused to Indian finance. But I cannot think that this reasoning is fair. Great Britain, in common justice for her own credit and interest, is bound not to send a less efficient Army to India than the one she maintains at home. And, even if this were not the case, the very many expenses which India must incur from the great mortality of troops, owing to her tropical climate, and the filling up of death vacancies and sending home invalids and men to replace them, would more than pay the Debt of India to this country.

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Papers showing why the conditions of service in the fifth paragraph of the Regulations for the Discipline and Payment of the Army Reserve, that the provisions of the Mutiny Act and Articles of War should apply to the Force whenever it is called out for training and exercise, were not carried out from 1871 to 2nd March 1876; and for any papers showing how many men of the 1st Class Army Reserve have been invalided.—(*The Lord Strathnairn.*)

VISCOUNT CARDWELL thought when the noble and gallant Lord rose, he was going to express his gratification that his own doleful expectations as to the result of the legislation in connection with the Reserves had not been fulfilled, but he (Viscount Cardwell) had not been gratified in that respect. When the late Government came into office, the principle of a Reserve had indeed been accepted by Parliament, but the number of men enlisted was insignificant. In 1870 the system was adopted of enlisting men for short service, with a view to the formation of an efficient Reserve. The question now therefore was, whether it was best to have a Reserve founded upon the principle of short service in the Line, in combination with civil employment afterwards; and the result of the system was seen exemplified in the case of the Prussian Army. What was the present state of affairs in connection with our own Army? Great facilities had been given by the late, and since extended by the present Government to men to choose whether they would serve for a long period with a pension, or for a short period, with civil employment afterwards. The result was that a very marked and decided preference, and a steadily increasing preference, had been shown for short service in the ranks, with civil employment during the period of service in the Reserve. The noble and gallant Lord said they could not expect to have a Reserve in existence, of course a system which only commenced towards the end of 1870, and required six years of actual service with the colours, as the general rule, could not be expected to have contributed great numbers to the Reserve, in the earlier part of 1876; but the Returns on the Table showed that at the end of 1875 there had enlisted over 57,000 men for short service, with subsequent civil employment, and there must have been a considerable number added to those figures since that time. The number enlisted now must be considerably over 60,000. This was certainly sufficient proof, that so far as numbers were concerned, the experiment had not failed. He should have thought that the noble and gallant Lord, with his experience, would have remembered what Lord Raglan said when he had less than 10,000 men in the Crimea available to defend the lines, and when the late Duke of Newcastle told him there were 2,000 recruits to send out—"For God's sake do not send them out, as they will only die like flies." What had been the remedy for that state of things? Why, the forming of a good Reserve force such as they had at present in progress, to which no objection could be made, inasmuch as it consisted of men who were inured to service, and who would be perfectly able to take their places beside the Regular troops in the field. The noble and gallant Lord might assert that we had an attenuated first line, but he knew perfectly well that for the purpose of resisting invasion, we never had before anything like so great a Force in the country in time of peace as that which was left by the late Government and was maintained by the present Government. As to the attenuated front line not being filled up by the Reserve, it should be borne in mind that the Act only passed in 1870, and of course i had not yet produced 60,000, or any larger number of men, for the Reserve. There was no enactment that men should go into the Reserve at the end of three years; there was indeed a power to send them into the Reserve at the end of that time; but there was a strong objection taken to acting on it by no one more pertinaciously than by the noble and gallant Lord himself. The late Government did not want to force the system, so they began with years in the Line and six years in the serve, and no large number of three rs' men had yet gone into the Reserve. e present Government, however, had owed men more freely to go into the serve than they could do before; but l the period had not come yet for pro- ing any very great effect upon the serves. The fruit was upon the tree, l was visible to the eye: but it was yet gathered, for the simple rea- that it was not yet ripe. When the sent system was first put in force, was said that they would not get n to the standards unless they al- ved pensions; but he had shown that re than 60,000 had enlisted for short vice, and the number who joined s not diminishing, but was increas- year by year. The tendency was nstantly increasing to go for a short, stead of a longer period. He should ve expected that the noble and gallant rd would have come forward and said at he had not been a sanguine person, d that he had not thought that such a serve as they now had would have en secured, but that, as a patriot and soldier, he was glad to acknowledge at he had been altogether mistaken, d that they had the prospect of a Re- rve of that character. So much then r the experiment as regarded numbers; w, as regarded the efficiency of the men ssed into the Reserve, he (Viscount rdwell) was sorry the noble and gal- nt Lord had not brought forward the otion at an earlier period of the Session hen the illustrious Duke (the Duke of ambridge), who had now left the coun- y, could have been present and stated s views on the subject. However, ey had before them a General Order the illustrious Duke which showed nclusively the state of efficiency of the en in the Reserve, and that it was ery good. A question was some time go raised that these men might be com- elled to serve with the Militia; but it as found, in answer to a circular which e (Viscount Cardwell) had issued to mmanding officers, that that would terfere too much with their civil mployments, and consequently it was ot pressed. Parliament, therefore, rovided, and the authorities now fol- wed, a course in regard to those men hich was least likely to interfere with heir civil employments. The noble ord asked why these men had not been ompulsorily called out since 1871. The answer was that a very successful trial was made in 1871, and it was proposed as a general rule to use the brigade depôts for the convenient training of the Reserve men in each neighbourhood and in 1872 and 1873 the depôts were not yet built; moreover, wages were very high, and to call the men out to a distance would have involved great loss, for which as they were almost all men of long service there was no sort of reason, but the brigade depôts were now being rapidly completed, and no doubt would be used for all the purposes for which they were designed by Parliament. He was very glad to say that the country had a good prospect of a strong Reserve force. The statistics showed that, and the General Order showed the character and efficiency of the men. He would not follow the remarks of the noble and gallant Lord in regard to the Treaty of 1856, because that matter had very lately been most fully and accurately explained by his noble Friend behind him (Earl Granville). In conclusion, he rejoiced that if ever they were called upon to fight such battles as they had fought a little more than 20 years ago, they would have a Reserve composed of trained men on whom they could rely, and they would not again hear the same despairing cry which they at that time heard from the Commander in Chief of the want of an efficient Reserve. He thanked their Lordships for having allowed him to occupy their time so long so soon after having spoken on the same subject.

Earl CADOGAN said, he was glad that the noble Viscount (Viscount Cardwell) had replied to the speech of the noble and gallant Lord (Lord Strathnairn), which appeared to have been directed chiefly to his action with regard to the system of short service and the Reserves, as anything he himself could say would not come with such force as what fell from the noble Viscount. He ventured, however, to join in the noble Viscount's remonstrance against the course pursued on that occasion by the noble and gallant Lord, and trusted he should not be thought presumptuous in doing so. The subject of short service and the Reserve was not a new one. It had been before the country and before the gallant and noble Lord himself, both in its details and its principles, for now more than five years; and in a Session in which their Lordships' House had certainly not been over-burdened with legislative business, it might, he thought, have been possible for the noble and gallant Lord to have brought forward a Motion, or by some other means to have taken an opportunity of laying his view before their Lordships at an earlier period, instead of waiting till one of the last weeks of the Session, and till the illustrious Duke the Commander-in-Chief had left the country, and many of their Lordships who were interested in that subject had been obliged to leave town. He would not follow the noble and gallant Lord in his general remarks, but would confine himself entirely to the Motion he had put upon the Table. The Motion was one for—

> "Papers showing why the conditions of service in the fifth paragraph of the Regulations for the Discipline and Payment of the Army Reserve, that the provisions of the Mutiny Act and the Articles of War should apply to the Force whenever it is called out for training and exercise, were not carried out from 1871 to 2nd March 1876."

The terms of the Motion were not quite accurate. The men who had been asked to volunteer, as had been stated, were under the Mutiny Act and the Articles of War while on service; and therefore the allegation that the regulations of the Mutiny Act and the Articles of War had not been carried out was incorrect. If the noble and gallant Lord would refer to the Appendix to the Returns he would find that when the Reserves were asked to volunteer for service in the Summer Manœuvres they presented themselves in considerable numbers. They were asked to volunteer because the Government did not wish to harass the men by taking them from their civil employments. Nothing had been concealed in the Returns. The War Office did not wish to conceal anything in this matter or in any other. They considered that the response which had been made by those Reserve men who were summoned had afforded a direct, straightforward answer to the question whether men in civil employment would come when they were called on; and although they were not the short service men who had passed six years in the Army, the War Office thought that test sufficient, and he believed that they and the country had reason to congratulate themselves on the result.

Lord STRATHNAIRN, in reply, stated that there was the greatest distinction between the Prussian compulsory Army system and ours, and that while in the Prussian Army there were no boys, ours was filled with them. At the same time, he highly praised the conduct of the military during the Fenian disturbances in Ireland. He contended that the short service system had been a failure.

Lord DORCHESTER said, he wished to address a few words to their Lordships in support of the Motion of his noble and gallant Friend (Lord Strathnairn), under whom he had served. It had been his good fortune to survive the campaign in the Crimea 20 years ago, and he could confirm what had been stated by the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Cardwell) as to Lord Raglan's words, that the second battalion recruits ought not to be sent out to die like flies. He had himself seen them die like flies. When the noble Viscount spoke of 60,000 men having enlisted for short service, his (Lord Dorchester's) reply was that that was a very small and insignificant Reserve force for the protection of the wealth, and treasure, and property of this country. There ought, in truth, to be five times that number. He was sorry that the illustrious Duke was not present, as no doubt he would have explained his views on the system of short service, and whether it would satisfy the wants of the country. No doubt, a certain proportion of men after 20 years' service would not be worth much, but they would be better than "the flies" of two years' service. Nor did he think that the three years' service men would be as good as the 20 years' men, who would die at their posts, and as long as they had a bit of bread would never complain, but would serve with that distinction which had excited the admiration of the French Generals.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *negative.*

ERNE, LOUGH AND RIVER BILL (No. 189), AND ARDGLASS HARBOUR BILL (No. 193).

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON, in moving that the Bills be now read the second time, said, that they were for the purpose of having works executed in Ireland which would

of great importance to that part of
country to which they referred. The
ond reading of the Bills had been
tponed because of objections which
l been raised by the noble Lord the
airman of Committees (Lord Redes-
e); but he had now received infor-
tion from Ireland which would re-
ve those objections, and as the Bills
uld go before the noble Lord's Com-
tee, he would be able to insert those
endments which he might consider
be necessary.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bills read 2ª accordingly, and *com-*
tted for *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at Seven o'clock,
till To-morrow, at quarter
before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 7th August, 1876.

INUTES.]—New Writ Issued—*For* Car-
marthen Borough, *v.* Charles William Nevill,
esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.
ew Member Sworn—Sir Walter Wyndham
Burrell, baronet, *for* the Borough of New
Shoreham.
upply—*considered in Committee*—Civil Ser-
vices—*Resolutions* [August 5] *reported.*
ays and Means—*considered in Committee*—
Resolution [August 5] *reported.*
ublic Bills—*Ordered*—*First Reading*—
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; Win-
ter Assizes (Ireland) * [290].
cond Reading—Parochial Records * [283].
lect Committee—*Report*—Local Government
Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Arti-
zans and Labourers Dwellings) * [260-287].
mmittee—Appellate Jurisdiction [111]—R.P.;
Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment *
[211]—R.P.; Legal Practitioners * [142]—R.P.
ommittee—*Report*—Sheriff Courts (Scotland) *
[96-289]; Queen Anne's Bounty * [278].
onsidered as amended—Local Government
Provisional Orders (Birmingham, &c.) *
[266]; Local Government Board's Provi-
sional Orders Confirmation (Bath, &c.) *
[264].
onsidered as amended—*Third Reading*—For-
feiture Relief * [259] and *passed.*
hird Reading—Police (Expenses) Act Con-
tinuance * [268]; Tramways (Ireland) Acts
Amendment (Dublin) * [207]; Municipal
Privileges (Ireland) * [39], and *passed.*
Withdrawn—Prisons (Scotland) * [247]; Prisons
(Ireland) * [197].

AFRICA (WEST COAST)—NATIVE LABOURERS—AFRICAN MAIL STEAMERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. ERRINGTON asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he is aware that the African Mail Steamers are constantly conveying natives enlisted from Sierra Leone and other British Ports on the African Coast, for labour, to St. Thomas and other Portuguese settlements; whether he has any information as to the chartering for the purpose of the traffic of the steamer "Sir Arthur Kennedy" by a Portuguese firm, and of its detention at Sierra Leone by the Governor; and whether he will lay upon the Table Copies of the Correspondence which may have passed on this subject between the Governor of Sierra Leone, the Colonial Office, the Foreign Office, and the Portuguese Government authorities?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: No representation or complaint, Sir, has been made to the Colonial Office that the African mail steamers are constantly conveying natives enlisted for labour to any of the Portuguese settlements. There is, of course, no legal impediment to Natives of the West Coast taking passages in the mail steamers for places beyond British territory. With regard to the *Sir Arthur Kennedy*, there has been a Correspondence relating to that vessel, arising out of the fact that a special permit was applied for to protect her from seizure. The object of the application was that her fittings-up resembled those that were used in slavers, and it was thought by the proprietors that a special permit would prevent any unnecessary seizure. The Portuguese Consul, however, had no information of the intended voyage, and the Lieutenant Governor refused the permit, in which course he has been supported by the Secretary of State. A Correspondence is now in progress respecting another vessel which shipped from Quitta, on the Gold Coast, a larger number of passengers than her tonnage warranted, and as this Correspondence is not yet concluded, it, of course, cannot be given. When it is concluded, I shall be happy to see how far it may be practicable to meet the wishes of the hon. Gentleman with regard to its presentation.

ARMY — MOBILIZATION — THE LONGFORD RIFLE MILITIA.—QUESTION.

Mr. ERRINGTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention had been called to the mismanagement which entailed much suffering and privation on the Longford Rifles during the late Mobilization; to the fact, for instance, that they had to march for eight miles to be reviewed by the Commander in Chief without having any water before starting; that on the review ground the supply of water was so small that many of the men got none all day, and both officers and men suffered severely in consequence on their return to camp; and, if he will cause inquiry to be made as to who was responsible for this mismanagement?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: I am sorry, Sir, that hon. Members from Ireland have had their attention called to the misfortunes of the Militia from that country. I have had no complaints in reference to English or Scotch regiments. In consequence of the hon. Member's Question I have made inquiry into the matter, and I find that there does not appear to have been any mismanagement connected with the Longford Rifles during the late mobilization, and no reports have been received of suffering and privation said to have been endured by the regiment. In common with others in the same brigade, they marched four miles to the ground and four miles back to be inspected by his Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief. The Brigade General has already reported that the brigade halted for three-quarters of an hour at Yarnborough, had water, and the water-carts were re-filled and accompanied the regiment to the review. No doubt, some inconvenience was experienced owing to the intense heat of the weather, but so far as I know from the Reports there was no such mismanagement as stated by the hon. Gentleman.

DOVER HARBOUR.—QUESTION.

Mr. FRESHFIELD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If the Government intend to proceed next Session with the Bill brought in but dropped in the last Session for completing the harbour and works at Dover; and, if not, whether they will give such timely notice in the Recess as will enable the local authorities to take such action as they may be advised to take in the matter?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am not, Sir, in a position definitively to state the intentions of the Government. They entirely recognize the justice of the latter part of the Question, and they will undertake that timely notice shall be given to the harbour authorities as to the course which the Government will pursue.

INDIA—BANDA AND KIRWEE BOOTY.

QUESTION.

General SHUTE asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If it is intended to refer the unadjusted prize alcims of Sir George Whitlock's force as regards the Kirwee Booty to the High Court of Admiralty; and, whether more prompt steps cannot be taken to settle these claims?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, there is no intention on the part of the Secretary of State for India to advise the Crown to refer to the Court of Admiralty any question in relation to the Banda and Kirwee prize money, nor is there any intention of disturbing the decisions already arrived at in the matter. The Secretary of State, after communication with the prize agents, has recently instructed the Government of India to wind up the accounts and take measures for a fourth and final distribution of the prize fund.

THE RECORD OFFICE—DESTRUCTION AND SALE OF PUBLIC RECORDS.

QUESTION.

Mr. W. GORDON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether any and what documents deposited in the Public Record Office or in any office which, by the Act 1 and 2 Vic. c. 94, has been declared a portion of that office have since the year 1841 been destroyed; whether any and what public records have been taken from the Public Record Office and sold; whether or not it is the fact that a great quantity of public records were sold by auction by Messrs. Sotheby on the 10th April 1869 and the five following days; and, if so, by whose authority such sale was made; and, whether it is the fact that

e Trustees of the British Museum pur-
ased any and what portion of such
ords or any other public records sold
, or by the authority of, the Public Re-
d Office at any other and what time?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, no
pers or documents deposited in the
cord Office under a warrant of the
aster of the Rolls, and countersigned
the Lord Chancellor, have ever been
stroyed. Until documents are brought
under such warrant they are not in
e custody of the Master of the Rolls as
right. Some documents belonging
the Treasury, Admiralty, and the
ar Office many years ago—about 1846
were allowed, for convenience, to be
posited in the Record Office at the
quest of those Departments without
y warrant, and form Class III. in the
atement printed with the rules. Some
this class of documents (III.), by
der of the Treasury, approved by the
ard of Admiralty and War Office,
re destroyed as useless on a Report of
e Committee of the Treasury, Admi-
lty, and War Office in 1859. With
gard to that part of the Question which
lates to the sale of documents, I have
letter from Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy,
hich gives this explanation:—

“Mr. Charles Devon, who was formerly a
rk in the Chapter House, Westminster, sold
the British Museum, on the 12th of April,
62, a volume of original Minutes of the Record
ommission from 1800 to 1830, together with a
umber of volumes relating to the late Record
ommission. These volumes came into Mr.
evon's hands from his relative, Mr. Caley,
eper of the Records in the Chapter House,
d Secretary to the Record Commission. In
dition to this, the Minutes of that Commis-
on, in 10 volumes, which were sent here by the
ome Office, are still in existence in this office.
ith reference to the statement that Messrs.
theby had seen at the Record Office the
pers and documents they subsequently sold
public auction on the 6th of April, 1869, I
ave to state that this charge is without a
adow of foundation. The papers in question
longed to the Duke of Leeds, and were sent
Messrs. Sotheby by Messrs. Guscotte, Wad-
am, and Daw, solicitors, Essex Street, Strand.
essrs. Sotheby state that they ‘never inspected
r saw the documents’ in question at the Public
ecord Office. The fact that the documents
ever were in the Record Office directly con-
adicts the statement made.”

RISH CHURCH TEMPORALITIES COMMISSION — NATIONAL MONUMENTS (IRELAND).—QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the
hief Secretary for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the recent Report of the Commissioners of Public Works, Ireland, in which Mr. Deane recommends that the list of national monuments should be increased, so as to include many round towers and churches worthy of preservation, and which could be saved for centuries by a trifling outlay; and, if so, whether any steps will be taken by the Commissioners of Church Temporalities to carry out the suggestion of Mr. Deane the superintending architect?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, the Report of the Commissioners of Public Works is addressed to the Treasury, of which that Board is a sub-department, and my attention had not been called to it until I saw the Notice of the hon. Member's Question. Nor have I any control over the Church Temporalities Commissioners; but they have informed me that, considering the large sums of money (£22,554) which they have already handed over to the Board of Works for the maintenance of ecclesiastical ruins as national monuments, they would not feel themselves justified in making further grants for similar purposes unless very cogent reasons are given to them for doing so. They are, however, still ready to give full consideration to any cases that may be brought under their notice. Special allusion is made in Dr. Deane's Report to the ruins of Clonmacnoise; but these ruins have been vested in the Representative Church Body under the 25th section of the Irish Church Act, and that body will, no doubt, take proper steps to preserve the ruins from further decay.

SPAIN—WAR TAXES IN CUBA.

QUESTION.

Mr. JACOB BRIGHT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the attention of the Government has been called to a statement in the “Diario de la Marina,” the official organ of the Spanish Government in Cuba, to the effect that the Germans, at the special request of their Government, are exempted from the oppressive war taxes now levied in that island; whether there are not treaties with Spain which place British subjects in all respects on the footing of the most favoured nation; and, whether such treaties might not be employed for the protection of British subjects?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, he had not seen the statement alluded to, but it was true that negotiations were going on between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Spain. It was correctly stated, he believed, that, pending those negotiations, German subjects had been temporarily, but not permanently, excused from the payment of those taxes. He did not think it would be expedient to say more at the present moment than that representations on the subject had been made to the Government of Spain, and the matter was receiving the earnest consideration of Her Majesty's Government. He could assure the hon. Member that all rights and claims which British subjects had should be carefully looked into and maintained.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

QUESTION.

Mr. MASSEY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the scheme for the re-organization of the Outdoor or Surveying Branch of the Inland Revenue has been received at the Treasury; and, if so, when the decision on it will be made known to the Service?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that several schemes connected with the branches of the Inland Revenue were now before the Treasury. When the immediate pressure of Parliamentary work was over he hoped to be be able to give his attention to the subject with a view to their consideration.

OFFICE OF CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF WORKS.—QUESTION.

Mr. DILLWYN asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether any steps have been taken to fill up the office of Chief Commissioner of Works vacated by the resignation of the noble Lord the Member for Chichester?

Mr. DISRAELI: Yes, Sir; I have taken steps to fill up that office.

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL—LORDS' AMENDMENTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. NORWOOD asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he can name the day on which the Consideration of the Lords' Amendments to the Merchant Shipping Bill will be taken?

Mr. DISRAELI: We must conclude, Sir, this evening, after the Report of Supply, with the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill and take the second reading of the Vivisection Bill, and we can then proceed with the consideration of the Lords' Amendments to the Merchant Shipping Bill.

DUNKELD BRIDGE TRUST.

QUESTION.

Mr. ANDERSON asked the Lord Advocate, When the Dunkeld Bridge accounts were last laid before the Commissioners of Supply for the county of Perth, as required by the Act; whether the debt on said Bridge is not yet extinguished; whether it be not the fact that the Dukes of Athole, in their capacity of trustees, borrowed money for said Bridge, and charged the Bridge accounts at a higher rate of interest than they borrowed at, and thereby increased the debt and delayed its extinction; and, whether he will recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the whole dealings of the Dukes of Athole with that Bridge trust?

The LORD ADVOCATE: Since the Question of the hon. Member was placed on the Paper, I have made inquiries into the matter in question. The Dunkeld Bridge Act provides that the accounts shall be laid before the Commissioners of Supply of Perthshire at their annual meeting in the month of April. The accounts for the year 1875 were accordingly laid before the meeting on 8th April last. The debt on the bridge is not extinguished. The last accounts show a balance due to the Duke of £11,838. The whole question of the bridge accounts was thoroughly investigated by the Court of Session, who found that the Duke of Athole was entitled to interest at the rate of 5 per cent upon the sum of £18,000, being the capital expended upon the bridge as from 7th November, 1808. Such being the finding of the Court, I do not consider that the Government have any right to address inquiries to the Duke as to what private arrangements he may have made with the persons who advanced the money for building the bridge. The whole dealings of the Duke

Athole with the Bridge Trust having en thoroughly and quite recently in- stigated by the Courts of Law, I am prepared to recommend the appoint- nt of a Royal Commission on the sub- t. The hon. Member can ascertain e facts more fully by referring to the oceedings in the litigation before the urt of Session.

MY—MILITIA SURGEONS—COMPENSATION.—QUESTION.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR asked the cretary of State for War, Whether it proposed to give compensation to those rgeons of Militia who under the New arrant will be deprived of a conside- ble portion of their present incomes, transferring to the medical officers the brigade depôts the duties for hich the Militia Surgeons have hitherto ceived pay?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, the w Warrant gives medical officers of ilitia an increase of rank and increase pay, subject to certain conditions. On e other hand, it takes from them, in ses where brigade depôts are formed, e duty of inspecting the recruits, who re inspected by Army surgeons without arge. This is advisable on public rounds, irrespective of money. It has een frequently a subject of complaint hat these Militia medical officers lost y having to neglect their private prac- ce in order to inspect the recruits. his appears, speaking generally, to be e only part of the Warrant by which hey lose. The attendance upon the ermanent Staff has generally been com- lained of as a source of loss. From his they will now be relieved when rigade depôts are formed, but they will ontinue to be employed on this duty hen no Army medical officer is avail- ble. Until the 31st of December next t will not be known how many Militia edical officers accept the new terms, nd until then I cannot undertake to nter upon a full consideration of the acts, nor can I give any pledge as to my ction.

CRIMINAL LAW—REMISSION OF SENTENCES.—QUESTION.

Dr. KENEALY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has received a Petition from Hanley Potteries, signed by clergymen and ministers of all religious denominations, and the inhabitants generally, praying for the remission of a sentence passed on three boys named Lewis, Platt, and Lancaster, two of them being nine years old and the other ten, by which they are to be detained in an industrial school until they are sixteen years old; and, if so, whether he intends to take any steps in the matter so as to alter or amend the sentence?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that inquiry had been made into the matter, and he found that the magistrates of Hanley Potteries had sent three boys, named Lewis, Platt, and Lancaster, to an industrial school—not a reformatory—until they were 16 years of age, as an act of kindness. An application had been made to him to remit the sentence, and from the information he had received it was hoped that the home of one of the boys was sufficiently respectable to permit of his returning to it, instead of working out his sentence. With regard to the others, their homes were such that it would be no act of kindness to compel them to return to them.

INDIA OFFICE RETURN.—QUESTION.

Colonel JERVIS asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether, from his statement on the 28th ultimo respecting the Furlough and Retiring Regulations of 1796, it is to be presumed that the India Office Return, 13th June last, is incorrect?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The India Office Return, Sir, dated June 13, 1876, is correct, not will there be found to be any discrepancy between that Return and the terms of the statement made by the Under Secretary for India on the 28th of July last.

ARMY—RETURN OF ARREARS OF PAY.

QUESTION.

Colonel JERVIS asked the Secretary of State for War, When the Return respecting the arrears of pay, ordered 23rd June, will be laid upon the Table?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he had signed the Return, and it would be laid on the Table almost immediately.

ARMY—PURCHASE AND EXCHANGE. QUESTION.

MR. HAYTER (for Sir HENRY HAVELOCK) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether an Officer of one of the old purchase regiments, now exchanging into one of the regiments formerly of the Indian Service, thereby forfeits the value which his commission held at the date of the abolition of purchase?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: No, Sir, he does not forfeit it. I may mention for the information of hon. Members who take an interest in the subject, that I am about to lay on the Table the Report of the Royal Commissioners on the subject of Promotion and Retirement in the Army.

PORTS, HARBOURS, &c., UNITED KINGDOM.—QUESTION.

MR. WHITWELL (for General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR) asked the President of the Board of Trade, If he could lay on the Table of the House a good descriptive List of all the Harbours, Ports, Piers, Creeks, Rivers, Docks, and Quays resorted to or used by vessels and boats for commerce, fishings, and refuge, distinguishing the owners of the several kinds; and, whether there is any descriptive Memoir of those Harbours, &c. when transferred to the Board of Trade, and their present state, with explanations as to the changes therein and outlays thereon since the transfer?

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY: Sir, it would be impossible for me to undertake to lay before the House such a descriptive list as is asked for in the Question of the hon. and gallant Member. A Return was made to this House in 1874 (Parliamentary Paper, 213) of the names, &c., of the port and harbour authorities in the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands, as furnished by the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Customs to the Board of Trade, but that Return does not contain the particulars now asked for. As regards the second portion of the Question, the only harbours which have been transferred to the Board of Trade are Ramsgate (which was transferred from the Harbour Trustees by the Harbours and Passing Tolls, &c., Act, 1861), Holyhead and Portpatrick (which were transferred from the Admiralty by the Harbours Transfer Act, 1862), Dover, St. Catherine's (Jersey), and Alderney (which were transferred from the Admiralty in pursuance of the Harbours Transfer Act, 1865). A Return was made to this House (Parliamentary Paper, 151) in 1869 containing Reports upon the works at Holyhead, Dover, Alderney, Spurn Point, Portpatrick, and St. Catherine's (Jersey). Reports, which have been printed, were made the same year by the officers of this Board upon Ramsgate and Holyhead Harbours. A Memorandum as to Ramsgate has since been presented to Parliament (Parliamentary Paper 154 of 1873), and a final Report by the Superintending Engineer upon Holyhead Harbour has also been presented (Parliamentary Paper 296 of 1873). Alderney Harbour has since been retransferred to the Admiralty by the Alderney Harbour (Transfer) Act, 1874; the works at Portpatrick have been abandoned, and the Board of Trade relieved from all liability in respect thereof by an Act passed in 1873; and the works at St. Catherine's (Jersey) have, with the sanction of the Treasury, been handed over to the Insular Authority.

INDIA—LEPROSY.—QUESTION.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is the intention of the Government to give effect to the suggestions of Dr. Henry Vandyke Carter, embodied in his Report "relative to Leprosy and Leper Asylums in Norway, with reference to India," presented to the Secretary of State for India in Council in 1873; or, if not, will the Indian Government take any and what action in the matter?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, in reply, said, it was not the intention of the Government to give effect to the suggestions referred to in the Question of the hon. Baronet. They had directed further inquiry to be made in India with a view to ascertain the correctness of the conclusions at which Dr. Carter had arrived as to the propagation of leprosy.

CUSTOMS—OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR. QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER asked the President of the Board of Trade, What legal arrangements have been made at the Board of Trade consequent

n the transfer to that department of
business of conducting inquiries into
alties to shipping, and the increase
prosecutions under the Merchant
pping Acts, 1854 to 1867, inclusively;
ther any and what description of
rd of Trade legal business hitherto
e by the Solicitor of Customs will
inue to be done by that Solicitor;
, whether any increase or reduction
he number of officers in his depart-
it, or in the amount of their salaries,
contemplation?

IR CHARLES ADDERLEY: Sir,
legal arrangements which have been
le at the Board of Trade consequent
n the transfer to that Department of
business mentioned in the Question
sist in the appointment of a Solicitor
he Board of Trade, and his staff is
course of formation. The only de-
ption of Board of Trade legal busi-
s, which will continue to be done by
Solicitor to the Customs as heretofore,
hat portion of the business relating to
registry of ships, which is transacted
ough the officers of Customs at the
ports and in London, and which has
yet been transferred by statute to
Board of Trade.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, that the
vernment had abolished the office of
istant Solicitor to the Customs.

RKEY—THE GENEVA CONVENTION.

QUESTION.

CAPTAIN NOLAN asked the First
rd of the Treasury, If the Suzerainty
sessed by the Porte over Servia and
imed over Montenegro, has the effect
depriving medical men and Am-
lance Corps of the immunity and pro-
tion which under the Geneva Conven-
n would be accorded to them in a
gular war between two independent
wers; and, if such is the case, or if it
doubtful that such is the case, whe-
er Her Majesty's Government is pre-
red in the cause of humanity to urge
the Porte, and if necessary on the Go-
rnments of Servia and Montenegro,
e advisability of immediately proclaim-
g that medical men and Ambulance
rps assisting the sick and wounded in
rkey will receive the consideration
d protection which they would be en-
led to in a war between two indepen-
nt Powers which had accepted the
eneva Convention?

MR. DISRAELI: I think, Sir, the hon. and gallant Gentleman will agree with me that the inconvenience which he anticipates from the Suzerainty of the Porte over Servia and Montenegro will not really interfere with the circumstances to which his Question refers when I tell him that it is not merely the Porte that has accepted the Geneva Convention, but that the Governments of Montenegro and Servia have also respectively accepted that Convention.

BARBADOES—THE LATE RIOTS.

QUESTION.

MR. THORNHILL asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he will explain to the House why the Bill passed by the House of Assembly in Barbadoes, for the trial of the prisoners before the Chief Justice and any two or more Commissioners, has not been carried through the other branches of the Legislature, and brought into effect?

MR. J. LOWTHER: A Bill, Sir, passed the House of Assembly in Barbadoes constituting a Special Commission for the trial of persons charged with complicity in the recent disturbances in that island. The reason why it has not passed into law is that a difference of opinion arose between the Assembly on the one hand and the Governor and Council on the other as to the personal composition of the Commission. A suggestion has, however, been made by the Secretary of State which there is reason to believe will meet the views of the Assembly and enable the trials to be held without further delay.

NEW FOREST—STONY CROSS INCLOSURE.—QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, as he stated some weeks since that the Law Officers of the Crown were considering the legality of an inclosure near Stony Cross in the manor of Minestead, in the New Forest, he will inform the House of their opinion on the subject; and whether, if they consider the said inclosure to be illegal, the Government intends to take any action in the matter, with a view of protecting the rights of the Crown in the New Forest?

MR. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown relative to the Inclosure near Stony Cross, in the manor of Minestead, in the New Forest, had not yet been received; but the case, which necessarily contained a history of the manor and references to various Acts of Parliament, was now before the Law Officers, and their opinions would be obtained as soon as possible.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1870—CARDIFF SCHOOL BOARD.

QUESTION.

MR. RICHARD asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether the Education Department have refused their sanction to the Cardiff School Board to acquire sites for the erection of schools in three districts of that town, which were scheduled by the Department as being the districts in which the educational deficiency was greatest, and after the Inspector of the Department, the Surveyor of the Department, and the Department itself had fully approved of the sites; and, if so, what were the reasons for that refusal?

VISCOUNT SANDON: Sir, the Cardiff School Board asked the consent of the Department to the compulsory acquisition of the three sites for schools referred to, in addition to another which has been passed. The first of these sites had been given by Lord Bute for a Children's Home and Hospital, and the Department refused their consent to the compulsory acquisition of this site for a board school. The second included a site which had been given for a church. In this case also the Department did not feel justified in giving their consent, and I consider that the refusal is justifiable; but negotiations are now going on, at the instance of the Department, between the school board and the clergyman who had the gift of this site, which we have every reason to believe will terminate in the acquisition by the school board of a part of the site suitable for the school board purposes, at the same time reserving the amount of site required for the church for which it was originally given. As to the third site, we are informed that there are difficulties now going on between the school board and Lord Bute's representatives; but we have a good hope that an arrangement will shortly be made between the parties. The hon. Member asks to be informed of the reasons which led to the course pursued by the Department in this matter. We refused our consent to the first two sites in their original form, as we felt that, considering the great difficulty which often exists in crowded towns in acquiring sites for such public purposes as hospitals, churches, chapels, children's homes, &c., it was not right, inasmuch as the school board has the choice of any site in the town by means of their powers of compulsory purchase, to allow them by the exercise of these powers to take possession of the hardly-acquired sites of institutions of public interest and utility, unless there was some absolute necessity for the selection of such sites.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

QUESTION.

MR. M'LAREN: I wish to put a Question to the Home Secretary, of which I have given him private Notice. I see that the Prisons (Scotland) Bill is down on the Paper for this evening; but I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will agree to postpone the measure until the passing of the English Bill, in order that the people of Scotland may have the advantage of whatever provisions for local self-government are accorded to the people of England.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I thought it was already understood that the Bill was to stand over until the English Bill had at all events passed a second reading.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.—RESOLUTION.

MR. DISRAELI moved—

> "That upon Tuesdays Orders of the Day have precedence over Notices of Motions, Government Orders having priority, and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays."

MR. BUTT, in rising to move, as an Amendment, to leave out the words "and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays," said, that he did not intend to oppose the first part of the Motion—that relating to Tuesdays; but he protested against the latter part, by which Government would take Wednesdays also. Wednesdays had als ys been appropriated to what were oneously called "private Members." ere were really no private Members. ey were all as much public Members the Members of the Government in t House; but it had been found con- ient for the transaction of Public Bu- ess that certain arrangements should made, which it was now proposed uld be set aside. Up to 1871 there l been only two attempts to take ednesday from the private Members, l what had occurred since 1871 showed danger of establishing that prece- nt. In 1853 the then Prime Minister, rd John Russell, proposed to take a ednesday and made a Motion to that ect, the object of which was to defeat Bill of the hon. Member for North arwickshire. The Motion, which was isted, was nevertheless carried, but it ly referred to one particular Wednes- y, and could not be fairly quoted as a ecedent in support of a proposal to e all the Wednesdays. In 1857 the vernment asked the House to allow em to put down Supply as an Order of Day on Wednesdays and take their ance with the other Orders, but the ouse declined to do so, so that 19 years o the same question was debated. In cent years encroachments had been ade over and over again upon the op- rtunities and privileges of private embers, and he thought the House ght to regard with very great jealousy y such proposal as the one then before It would not do for private Members give up their right of discussing sub- cts in the House; and although it ight be thought that great waste of ne was caused by the discussion of ills introduced by unofficial Members, t that was not really the case. So far om being useless, the discussion of ch Bills often led to important legis- tion. The House was becoming more nd more a Chamber for the registering Government proposals, and in this spect it was giving up to a great ex- nt its own proper functions, and losing no small degree the power they held er public opinion of the country. He ad a Bill on the Paper for Wednesday ext in reference to University education Ireland. The measure was one to hich considerable importance was at- ched, and, as matter of fact, several epresentatives of Irish constituencies ere at that moment on their way to England, in order to take part in the discussion. He did not expect any material advantage to result from the discussion on that day, as he could not say he should persevere with the second reading; but the consideration of the Bill would not take very long, and the subject was one that ought, if possible, to be decided without loss of time. On all these grounds he would submit to the House his Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays."—(*Mr. Butt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. DISRAELI said, there was no desire or intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government to invade the rights of independent Members of the House with regard to Wednesdays. On the contrary, they had always upheld such rights. It was intimated a short time back by himself that if the House would accord to the Government the privilege of taking precedence on Wednesdays, they would be grateful for the gift, as it would materially assist the progress of Public Business; but the proposal was not pressed when hesitation was expressed on the part of some hon. Members. It certainly seemed unreasonable, therefore, at the end of the Session for a private Member to ask for the solitary Wednesday that remained. He could understand that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Limerick was deeply interested in the Bill which stood in his name on the Order Book for Wednesday next, and he had a very good opportunity for proceeding with it on Wednesday last, when it stood first in the Orders of the Day, but he postponed the stage, and could not therefore blame any one for the fact that it stood over. As he had said, the Government had no desire to invade the privileges of private Members; but they had arrived at a period of the Session when, in ordinary circumstances, a single day was of moment, and, as business at present stood, it would be of inestimable value, for there were one or two Bills that had yet to go to the other House of Parliament. He hoped, therefore, that the hon. and learned Member would not press his Motion, for he had already explained his Bill to the House, and could hardly expect to obtain a satisfactory settlement of the question this Session, even if Wednesday next were at his disposal.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, it appeared to him to be perfectly correct, as stated by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), that the unofficial Members of the House were gradually being placed in a very disadvantageous position. Their privileges were being curtailed by degrees, and it would be well for them to seek a remedy for a growing evil. In his opinion, much would be gained if a slight alteration were made in the mode of introducing Bills by unofficial Members. He hoped that as early as possible steps would be taken by means of which unofficial Members would be enabled to give such Notice of their intention to introduce Bills as should inform the House beforehand of the general nature and provisions of the measures in question. The House would then be in a position to judge whether it was one likely to promote any practical purpose; and, if not, it could be rejected at once, instead of being allowed to cumber the Order Book at future stages, merely to serve as a peg on which to hang a discussion. He ventured to make that suggestion to the House in the interest of Government as well as of non-official Business.

Mr. DILLWYN said, he quite agreed with the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) that something should be done to prevent such a glut of measures as appeared on the Order Book as the Session drew to a close. At the same time, he thought the Government request to take next Wednesday was only reasonable, and he hoped the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) would not press his Amendment. He had heard with satisfaction the promise of the Prime Minister that the interests of private Members should not be thrust aside unnecessarily; but he could not avoid complaining that private Members were not treated as they ought to be, and he specially objected to the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman in refusing to give the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) a night to discuss a Motion of No Confidence, merely because it had not received the approbation of the front Opposition Bench. He thought it was only right that the right hon. Gentleman and the Government should know this.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he did not rise to continue the debate upon the Motion, although the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) was well within his right in claiming, if he thought fit to do so, Wednesdays for the discussion of Business introduced by non-official Members of the House. The question, however, at that period of the Session was one that should be determined upon grounds of general convenience. The hon. and learned Gentleman had already announced that he did not expect any immediate result to follow the discussion of his measure next Wednesday, and therefore it would be for him to determine whether it would be expedient to enforce his right in the matter; seeing the state the House would be in by the middle of this week, it would be impossible to rely upon having full discussion on other than Government measures. What he desired, however, to ask before the Motion was passed was whether any Member of Her Majesty's Government could state what was to be the order of Public Business during the present week. He believed the right hon. Gentleman had already stated that the Order of Business for that evening would be that after the Report of Supply had been agreed to the Appellate Jurisdiction and the Cruelty to Animals Bill would be taken. He had no opposition to offer to the last-named measure, but he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that it was a Bill of considerable importance, and after what had been said with regard to it out-of-doors he trusted that it would not be passed without an opportunity being given for a tolerably full discussion upon it. He wished, therefore, to ask whether there was any intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government to proceed with that measure at an hour that would preclude discussion being had upon it, or would prevent such discussion from being recorded, or whether it was intended to make arrangements for a discussion being taken upon it on a subsequent day. A promise had been made at an earlier period of the Session that an opportunity would be afforded for discussing the Suez Canal Shares Bill, and although from the state o

blic Business it would be impossible
t any full discussion could be had
n that measure, still some hon.
mbers were anxious to raise certain
estions with reference to it. In these
umstances, it would be convenient if
Government could state on what day
t Bill would be taken.

MR. NORWOOD wished to know
en the Merchant Shipping Bill would
taken, seeing that the Lords' Amend-
nts effected several important altera-
ns in the measure, one reversing a de-
on of that House arrived at by
ision, and another reversing a decision
that House arrived at by agreement
h the Government. He trusted,
refore, that full and ample oppor-
nity would be given for considering
se Amendments.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHE-
JER said, that the Government were
st anxious that ample time should be
ven for discussing both the Cruelty to
imals Bill, the Suez Canal Shares
ll, and the Lords' Amendments to the
rchant Shipping Bill; but, of course,
was obvious to the House that the
ssibility of doing that depended upon
ilities being given, such as the Go-
rnment were now asking for. The
pellate Jurisdiction Bill ought to be
oceeded with as quickly as possible,
order that the necessary Orders in
uncil carrying it into effect might be
epared. It was impossible to say how
ng the Report of Supply was likely to
ke that evening, because there were
veral Notices upon the Paper that
uld precede it, and questions might
raised upon the details of the Report
elf. It was hoped, however, that the
ouse would not occupy any great length
time in discussing those matters, and
at real progress would be made with
e Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, which
trusted would pass through Com-
ittee that evening. The Cruelty to
nimals Bill and the Suez Canal Shares
ill also required further discussion, and
trusted that an ample opportunity
ould be found for its being had—not
ly upon those Bills but also upon the
ords' Amendments to the Merchant
hipping Bill. It was, however, no
se in attempting to fix days for them
present. Before he sat down he
ished to refer to an observation which
ad fallen from the hon. Member for
wansea (Mr. Dillwyn), who had spoken
as though his right hon. Friend the Prime Minister had said that he was disposed to take no notice of a Vote of Censure moved by unofficial Members. Nothing that his right hon. Friend had said would bear that construction. The matter to which the hon. Member was referring was of a different character from what he attributed to it. What his right hon. Friend had then said was, that it was impossible to give up Government days to enable Notices bearing the character of Votes of Censure to be brought forward, unless those Notices were in the nature of important Party Motions, and supported by the Leaders of the Opposition. The days which had been given up in the course of the Session to the hon. and learned Member for Limerick and other hon. Gentlemen had helped to place the Government in such a position at the end of the Session that they were obliged to ask for days which belonged to private Members. But there was no intention on the part of his right hon. Friend to imply any indisposition to attend to the Motions brought forward by unofficial Members.

MR. LOWE: Are we to understand that the Suez Canal Shares Bill and the Cruelty to Animals Bill will be taken this evening?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Not after 11 o'clock.

MR. LOWE: Surely 11 o'clock would be too late for the Cruelty to Animals Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think I may say that that Bill will not be taken this evening.

MR. MUNDELLA said, that while everybody was no doubt anxious to facilitate the progress of Business, there was still a great deal to do, and amongst other important questions was the Indian Budget, of which nothing had yet been said. Already sufficient Notices had been given to occupy every Wednesday during next Session. Other Notices would, no doubt, be given. He hoped to secure a day for a Motion of which he had not yet given Notice—for the establishment of Free Libraries and Museums. He should be glad if his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick could conveniently put off the discussion of his Bill to another Session; but, at the same time, he should feel it his duty in the interests of private Members, on whose rights continual encroachments were being made, to support his hon. and learned Friend's Amendment. If hon. Members yielded to the demands of the Government now without some show of resistance the Government would become more reckless with its time. Not having economized its own time, the Government must now draw on the time of private Members. If the Government had been more careful of its time during the last fortnight it would not now have had to occupy a single half-hour of that which should be devoted to private Members.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, with reference to an obsertion of the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), that the Indian Budget would be taken on Thursday.

Captain NOLAN thought it very important that a discussion should be held, even at this late period of the Session, on the Universities (Ireland) Bill. Although it was known that the Oxford and Cambridge University Bills could not pass this Session, the Government considered it necessary that they should be discussed, and it was even more important for Ireland that the next stage of his hon. and learned Friend's Bill should be taken than it was for England to discuss the two University Bills.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY begged to state, with reference to what had fallen from the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, that not a single Irish Bill had been introduced into that House which it had not been intended to proceed with, and which had not been carefully considered by a Committee or Cabinet of the majority of the Irish Members.

Mr. FAWCETT asked whether the Indian Budget, which he understood was to be taken on Thursday, would be the First Order on that day?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER replied that it would be the principal business for Thursday, but as to whether any small business might not be taken before it he could not say.

Mr. BUTT said, he should not feel justified in not taking the decision of the House on his Amendment.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 99; Noes 45: Majority 54.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Ordered, That upon Tuesdays Orders of the Day have precedence over Notices of Motion, Government Orders having priority, and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays.

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Report of Supply be now received."

RAILWAY ACCIDENT — REWARD TO JOHN CHIDDY.—OBSERVATIONS.

Lord ELCHO rose, in pursuance of a Notice which had stood a long time on the Paper,

> "To call attention to the circumstances of the death of John Chiddy, a plate layer on the Bristol and Exeter Railway, in the endeavour to avert a Railway accident."

It seemed that John Chiddy was superintending the removal of blocks of stone from a waggon at a station near Bristol when one of the blocks fell on to the line when the express train "Flying Dutchman" was only a few hundred yards off. In his desire to avert danger to the coming train he jumped down and removed the stone, but, unfortunately for his widow and children, was struck by the engine and killed. It was an act of great courage and self-sacrifice; for the man lost his life in the endeavour to prevent a catastrophe, and there was no knowing how many lives he had saved. There was a coroner's inquest on the body, and the jury, who returned a verdict of "Accidental death," expressed their sense of the bravery of the act which had cost John Chiddy his life, and out of sympathy for the widow gave up their own small fees to her. He was a quarry foreman nearly 50 years of age, and he had left a family unprovided for. He (Lord Elcho) did not know what the railway company had done for them, or whether it had done anything; but corporations generally had no consciences, and such an act of bravery, reflecting as it did, however, on the State, ought to receive public recognition, by distinction if a man survived, and compensation to his family if he lost his life. It might be said this was a case for public subscription, and the answer was that a gentleman who saw the act endeavoured to get up a public subscription on behalf of the widow and children, but the result was only a sum of £3 17*s*. It was to be regretted that re was no provision in this country to ard such courageous and humane duct as that of John Chiddy. Had been a soldier or a sailor, and risked life gallantly to save the lives of ers, his bravery would have been re-nized, and in the one case he would ve received the Victoria Cross, and in other the Albert Medal. But there s not in this country any provision for widows and children of civilians who, e John Chiddy, risked and lost their es in their daring and noble efforts to e the lives of others. It was not so in er countries. In Germany, for in-nce, there was a sum of £50,000 ed to meet cases wherein civilians d lost their lives in trying to avert eat calamities, and so to assist the dows and children who had lost their ly means of support. He (Lord cho) thought that the Albert Medal ght be given to those civilians who perilled their own lives to save the es of others; and he trusted that, in ation to the great and heroic act of hn Chiddy, which might well be sup-sed to have saved numbers from death d others from serious injury, it would considered in a just spirit, and lead some public recognition in behalf of s widow and children. He trusted, erefore, that the right hon. Gentleman the head of Her Majesty's Govern-ent and the Chancellor of the Exche-er would take the case of John hiddy's widow and children into con-deration. By testifying to their appre-ation of such gallant deeds they en-uraged others to do likewise, with the ll assurance that if they perished in heir noble efforts to preserve the lives f others, at any rate their families ould not be dependent upon charity.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHE-UER said, he was pleased that the ttention of the House had been drawn o the subject, which there could be no oubt, as recorded in the newspapers, was an act of great gallantry; but hitherto it had not formally been brought under the notice of the Government. He did not think it would be advisable for he Government without some formal representation to take any steps in the matter; but if any representation was made, no doubt it would be considered. There were no funds available for the Government to give rewards in cases of this sort, but still there had been instances in which small sums or medals had been given to mark the sense of the Government of acts of considerable gallantry. He thought, however, his noble Friend rather set aside the position of the railway company in this matter. This man Chiddy was in the service of the railway company, and lost his life in performing an act which was of the greatest service to the company, saving not only their train from destruction, but also saving them the payment of considerable compensation for injuries to and loss of life. Therefore he thought that it was to them that, in the first instance, representations should have been addressed as to the making of an allowance to the man's family. He had no particular knowledge on the subject, but the House would feel that, without being cold and indifferent in the matter, it was the duty of the Government to wait until the matter came more formally and more regularly before them.

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made an important admission, because he had stated that the railway company should make provision for this man's family, inasmuch as he had lost his life in their service. There was at present in the Lobby of that House a large subscription list being raised on behalf of the sufferers by the accident on the *Thunderer* and their families. He wished to put it to the Government whether, the men having as justly perished in the service of the country as if they had been in action, it was not for the Government to come forward and relieve them with a vote for their families, and not leave it to private charity.

SWEDEN—BRITISH CHURCH AT STOCKHOLM.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, in rising "to call attention to the condition of the British Church at Stockholm," said, that in the year 1855, under the Consular Chaplains Act of George IV., a British Consular Chaplain was appointed at Stockholm. In 1858 steps were taken to build a Consular Church, which was finished and consecrated in 1866. It was built at an expense of £3,928, and Divine worship had since been carried on, partly by means of Government grants and partly by the subscriptions of British subjects, at an expense of £6,931. From 1855 to the present year that British Church had been kept up by grants from the British Government and British subjects to the amount of £10,600. A certain class of non-British subjects had contributed towards it the sum of £227. A change was made by the late Government in the status of the Consular Chaplains, to which the present Government had, to an extent which he could not justify, conformed, and among the sufferers were the British community at Stockholm. Up to 1867 the affairs of the church were managed by a committee, of which the British Consul was the chairman. Unfortunately, no proper legal constitution of the church was agreed to, according to the laws either of England or Sweden, although there were some memoranda on the subject, while every one understood whom it was for, and what worship was to be celebrated—namely, that the persons using the church were British subjects, worshipping according to the forms of the Church of England. The fact of its being a Consular chaplaincy was considered a sufficient guarantee, and the church was not in strict legal form vested in any one. But upon the withdrawal of the Government grant, and the consequent termination of the Consular chaplaincy, the protection of the Government determined, and the committee were thrown on their resources. In their distress they obtained the services of a gentleman as clergyman who had previously been a schoolmaster, who at a late period went abroad, and who was never able to get a licence from the Bishop of London. Between July and December, 1875, he made the place "too hot" for him, and tendered his resignation, which the committee too hastily, perhaps, accepted. With equal rapidity he withdrew it, and called a meeting of the English-speaking inhabitants of Stockholm, and this mixed multitude and chance-medley of the English-speaking population, who followed the Tabernacle, and who had given the £227 as against the £10,600, voted themselves the general committee and voted out the real committee. They assumed the custody of the chapel, and appointed the Chaplain as chairman. He recognized this committee as the sole acting committee for all purposes except one—he held the original committee responsible for the payment of his salary. He (Mr. Beresford Hope), in appealing to Parliament, did not wish to snatch a legal opinion, but dealt with this matter as one to be governed by rules of honour, and of substantial, as opposed to mere technical, justice. If this clergyman had got the Bishop of London's licence there would have been no difficulty; but the right rev. Prelate did not feel himself justified in issuing a licence. The original committee would not give up the church, so this minister of peace first brought a civil suit against them, and afterwards a criminal suit, because they, *pro formâ*, locked the door of the church, which was then broken open by the Swedish municipal authorities. The civil suit was decided in favour of the original committee; and they might have thought that the matter would have ended there; but after the civil suit had been decided in favour of the original committee, in the criminal suit a decision was given for the other party, and on account of the merely ceremonious locking of the door of the church they were fined 2,000 dollars a-piece and costs. Though the decision had been appealed against, the money had to be paid into Court, while the gentlemen so cruelly amerced were persons of limited means, and the tyrannical act of the Criminal Court might bring great inconvenience upon these excellent persons. If the Foreign Office could see its way to reinstate the Consular chaplain at the very smallest amount of stipend all its old rights in the Church would revive. Failing that, if they would even make a strong and dignified representation to the Swedish Government, he thought it would tend to settle this question. They would thus relieve very excellent people from a great and grievous difficulty, and provide religious services for the 2,000 British sailors and large number of British travellers who passed through Stockholm annually.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS hoped that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Hope) would not think his hon. Friend (Mr. Bourke) wanting in respect in not replying at once, as there was another question to which his attention would be called, and he would not have the right of speaking twice. His hon. Friend would have to address the House in reply to the Motion of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr.

derson) and he would take that later portunity of replying to the hon. mber.

DIAN CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITION.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. LOWE, in rising

to call attention to the decision announced Despatch from the Secretary of State for ia to the Governor General in Council, dated 30th day of September 1875, that the allowe of £150 a-year now granted to successful ndidates for Indian Service during their two rs of probation will be withdrawn from all ndidates selected in July 1878, or later, who not pass their probation at some University be approved by the Secretary of State for lia,"

id, that the noble Lord the Secretary State for India had been turning his tention to the regulations as to the ccessful competitors for positions in the dian Civil Service, and in doing so d arrived at certain conclusions. The ble Lord seemed to have spared no ins to enlighten himself on the subct, and everything he had said and one deserved great respect and consideration. It had been determined that e maximum age of competitors might e reduced, and, further, that it was esirable the successful competitor should ass the two years of his probation beore leaving for India at a University. or the purpose of what he was about o say he would assume that those conlusions were right. It was clear, however, that the idea of the noble Lord was, at first, that the two years should be spent at Oxford. Further, it was proposed that the successful candidates should during each of those two years receive £150, and that they should pass their probation at a University to be approved by the Secretary of State. This system was not to be enforced by positive order, but by withdrawing from the persons who did not go to the University fixed upon the allowance of £150 a-year. Now, if the Government of India was of opinion that it was right these young men should go to a University, they would be perfectly within their right and jurisdiction in making an order to that effect; but he could not bring himself to think that their going should be enforced by something in the nature of a fine. A man in easy circumstances who thought his son would do better at home than at Oxford could keep him there by simply sacrificing £300, whereas a poor man would have no alternative; and the result was to produce great injustice by setting up two standards for men who differed in nothing but their wealth, and to allow a rich man, merely because of his wealth, to infringe what the Secretary believed to be a useful and valuable regulation. If the Secretary of State was convinced that it was a good thing for a young man to go to some University, let him take the responsibility of boldly saying so; for where young men were pitted one against the other, there should be no advantage whatever given to one over the other by the mere possession of wealth; but was it quite so clear that either by compulsion or a fine these young men should be made to go to a University? He did not ask for any decision now, but hoped that the suggestion he made would be considered. Then, again, the Secretary of State clearly had the University of Oxford in his mind. He had been in communication with the authorities of that University on the subject, and he was Chancellor of the University. The proposal was that the probationers should each receive £150 a-year during the two years. Well, 40 years ago £150 a-year was not enough money to live upon at Oxford, and it would not go as far now as it did then. These young men would go to Oxford with allowances of £150 a-year, and although that sum would be inadequate to their support, they would possess almost unlimited credit with the harpies who made disreputable livings by lending money at exorbitant rates of interest to members of the University, for the reason that they would have fortunes secured to them in the Indian Civil Service, dependent only upon their passing satisfactorily through a period of probation, and afterwards retaining their health so as to perform the duties devolving upon them. That was a consideration which could not be too seriously entertained before fixing upon Oxford. But it seemed that the Secretary of State had abandoned the idea which he originally entertained of having them only at Oxford; and he (Mr. Lowe) apprehended that no course could be more injurious than that of scattering these young men amongst a number of places. He could not help regarding it as a mistake for the reason that there was no existing English University at which these young men could obtain the special education they required, and if their University probation was to be worth anything it would be necessary to form special departments in each of the Universities to which they might proceed for the purpose of giving the necessary instruction. It could not be expected that the Universities would bear the cost of thoroughly efficient special departments to meet the requirements of a few students; and therefore the men would in the majority of cases be compelled to pay private tutors in addition to the sums payable to the Universities. If a really efficient system was to be established, it could only be done by providing that these young men should go to some one institution, and that institution, in his view of the matter, ought to be in the immediate neighbourhood of London, if not in London itself. It was important that an *esprit de corps* should be maintained among Indian Civil Servants, and this would not be possible if the candidates for the Service were to be scattered over all the Universities in the country. Most of these young men when they got out to India would be sent away into solitude, and it was important that before going out they should have some such experience of life as could be obtained at its best in London, which was the seat of government, the centre of the legal system, the great mart of the world, and the place where, of all others, the full current of life ran at its fastest, and, perhaps, at its clearest. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would seriously consider the point which he had brought forward; and, in conclusion, he wished it to be clearly understood that he was not speaking in the interest of the University of London, which he had the honour to represent, because that, being an examining and not a teaching body, was not a University in which these young men could possibly pass their period of probation, for it could not possibly provide the necessary instruction.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON thanked the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Lowe) for the kind and friendly tone of the remarks which he had offered upon the proposals of the Secretary of State for altering the present system of training candidates for the Indian Civil Service. He (Lord George Hamilton) acknowledged the weight which attached to all the right hon. Gentleman's opinions in respect to University education, and was glad to find that his objections were so qualified as almost to amount to praise. It was impossible that any Secretary of State, after the preponderance of evidence embodied in the Blue Book, could have maintained the old system of training and selection in its entirety, and the two alterations which his noble Friend proposed were—first, to reduce the limits of age; and, secondly, to enforce indirectly a residence at a University after the candidates had passed their first examination. There was a strong preponderance of opinion both on the part of the men who were trained at Haileybury under the old system and of the competition men in favour of association, and the Secretary of State considered that this object would be best accomplished by putting indirect compulsion on the candidates so as practically to enforce them to go to a University. He understood the right hon. Gentleman did not object to the alteration of the limit in respect to age, but thought that attendance at the University should be secured by direct rather than by indirect compulsion. The compulsion to attend the University was only indirect, because any candidate who had no wish to pass through the University course could refrain from doing so by declining a grant which, according to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, would not be sufficient to maintain him while there. If any grant was to be made from the State in order to enable a candidate to complete his education for a service which he desired to enter, it was surely no injustice for the State to insist upon his going through the educational course which was deemed to be the most fitting for the purpose contemplated. There was much to be said in favour of making attendance at a University compulsory, but it was felt that in making an alteration of this kind the steps should be gradual. He might say, however, that if the indirect compulsion contemplated by the present scheme proved successful, and if it should be found, after the experience of a few years, that the young men benefited by association at a University, he had no doubt that all candidates would be forced to go there. The er suggestion of the right hon. Gentle- n was open to the objection that if the retary of State were to select any one iversity to which these young men uld go—say Cambridge, Oxford, or blin—he would place a monopoly in hands, and at once get rid of the nciple of competition which ought to st between the Universities. If they re all allowed to offer inducements to ung men to go to them there could be y little doubt that the University ich gave the best education would t the greatest number of men. The ht hon. Gentleman also thought that 50 was not sufficient to enable young n to go to Oxford, and that they uld be likely to fall into the hands of money-lenders; but if that were ely to be the case, surely it was more ely to prove so in London than at her Oxford, Cambridge, or Dublin. sides, London had its disadvantages well as advantages; for instance, the ht hon. Gentleman had himself de- ribed one advantage of living in Lon- n as being that when one wished to ink water he could get nothing but wage. [Mr. LOWE remarked that the xford water was worse still.] He could sure the right hon. Gentleman that e Secretary of State did not look upon s scheme as perfect, and any sug- stions which were made from time to ne for its improvement would receive e consideration of his noble Friend.

URKEY—THE REPORTED ATROCITIES IN BULGARIA.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. ANDERSON said, he felt that owed some explanation to the House r bringing forward at such very short otice what appeared to him to be an xtremely important subject, but the ct was that there was no other course pen to him. It was only that day and e day before that documents had come hand, and that Papers had been pub- shed which appeared to render it ighly desirable that the House of Com- ons should have another opportunity f expressing its opinion upon these trocities; and every hon. Member knew ell that at that period of the Session ere was no possible way of calling ttention to the subject except on the eport of Supply. He could have ished that attention had been called to he matter by a more influential Member than he, for he felt that the news which they had heard lately upon this subject really called for the expression of a very strong opinion indeed on the part of the House of Commons. It would be in the recollection of the House that on the 10th of July last they had a short debate on the subject of the Bulgarian atrocities, and they on that (the Liberal) side of the House, and certainly a very great many people out of it, were extremely dissatisfied with the tone adopted by the Prime Minister in his reply on that occasion. They considered that the right hon. Gentleman was treating a very important subject with great levity. They considered that he was rather palliating and justifying and denying the truth of things which appeared to them to be only too well founded to have been treated in that way. All that they had heard since had proved that the opinion which they entertained in regard to that matter was correct. He had himself received papers and letters from Constantinople announcing the receipt of the papers with reports of that debate in them, and the feeling amongst the European population at Constantinople was one of great disgust with the way in which Her Majesty's Government and Her Majesty's Minister out there had treated the matter. With the permission of the House, he would take the liberty of reading an extract from a newspaper — *The Stamboul* — published in Constantinople—

> "Apropos of the excesses committed by the irregular troops, we must notice a fact that might be of importance—that is to say, the debates which have taken place in the English Parliament on the subject. The public of our city, both Mussulmans and Christians, have imbibed a painful impression from reading the despatch announcing that the English Ministry, by the avowal of Mr. Disraeli, has been kept in ignorance of these facts, and that having asked for information from their Ambassador, he has charged as exaggerations the horrors narrated by the correspondent of *The Daily News*, and had even taken up the defence ef the Circassians and the Bashi Bazouks, by alleging that they had done no more than make reprisals. We wait the more official account of the Chamber to confirm or otherwise this version, so as not to commit ourselves to the word 'defence,' for we do not believe, with the knowledge which we have of the country, that there exists one single Mussulman capable of being willing to take the defence of the Circassians. By an unfortunate coincidence, the same day that this discussion took place in the House of Commons, the Turkish Government sent one of its Ministers into Bulgaria to make an inquiry. We have

> learned since that the Commission appointed by the Minister has hanged on the field five of these plunderers, and everybody has read the proclamation of the Grand Vizier, which is an indirect avowal of all the misdeeds committed. Sir Henry Elliot, when he applies in such a case the word 'reprisals,' seems ignorant that many months before the breaking out of the insurrection the newspapers were filled with mournful details of plunder and disorders committed by the Circassians and Bashi Bazouks, and that the Government was warned that it must expect an insurrection if it did not take measures to repress these abuses. On which side, then, were the reprisals. But even if there was no truth in the facts quoted by the newspapers such rumours deserved to have the attention of the Ambassador, and he ought always to have informed his Government. Now it results, in the language of Mr. Disraeli, that the English Government had not even suspected the existence of such facts, although it was so much its interest to know them."

He would next read a short extract from a private letter—

> "Christians of all denominations here were very much shocked at the attempted palliation by the British Government and Sir Henry Elliot of the atrocities committed upon Christians by Mussulmans in the interior. These atrocities were notorious here many months before the so-called Bulgarian insurrection."

Now, it would be observed that it was stated that these atrocities were being committed many months before the so-called insurrection. It was stated that this so-called insurrection was to have taken place on the 1st May, but that it had been anticipated by a few days, and he would now show by extracts from Constantinople newspapers that in November and December, 1875, these atrocities were going on. One account said—

> "On the night of the 4th October the Mussulmans of Sulmeschli district of Eski Zagra, set fire to the dwellings of the Bulgarians and fired guns. The Bulgarians fled from their houses and the village, but were surrounded by Mussulmans, who fired on them, killing some and wounding a great many. Those who were caught had atrocious tortures to suffer, putting fire in the hair of some, thrusting red-hot irons into the tongues of others, and making others dance barefooted on a heap of thorns. When at last gendarmes came to their assistance, six men were found dead, fifteen wounded, and many women and children half dead."

Another account said—

> "The inquiry opened by the authorities discovers every day some new abuse. For instance, Sadik Bey, in company with some of his companions in iniquity, recently went through these villages, violating the young Bulgarian girls. Among the girls thus dishonoured may be mentioned the little daughters of Diado Stoyan, of the village of Chahmali. The village of Sulmeschli has a population of Bulgarians and Mussulmans. The latter, armed with implements of labour and other weapons, in the middle of the night, attacked the Bulgarian part of the village, have killed 12 men and have wounded 8, and violated 10 young girls and 3 young women. They then retired, having taken away the grain and other provisions, and the furniture of the houses. Kasanka, near Eski Zagra, is also inhabited by Bulgarians and Mussulmans. The forest guard, with some other Mussulmans, having at their head two gendarmes, attacked the Bulgarian houses in the middle of the night, and having seized 15 of the richest, imprisoned them in a hut, and, with knives at their throats, demanded money, and in this way extorted 46 livres. This process was repeated by the same individuals at the villages of Baloukli and Ada Tépé. The peasants complain in vain because Hadji Tahir Aga, one of the notables of Eski Zagra, protects the culprits for his own ends. That Hadji Tahir Aga and his colleague Emine Bey are the misfortunes of the country. They are one of the causes of the many violations committed on young Bulgarian girls. They also commit an infinity of abuse in forcing the peasants to reap, to labour, and carry wood for them without payment, and then they are despoiled of their fields and dare not complain, for these men hold the offices of caimacan and cadi in town and country.
>
> A certain Kourtschi Osman, at the head of some Mussulmans, has gone through the villages of the district Kezanlik, taking ransom from the richest inhabitants. He says to them—Pay me 8 livres Turkish or I will denounce you to the authorities as taking part in the revolutionary committee. The peasants pay the sum demanded to escape torture or perhaps death, and Kourtschi Osman, with his companions, has taken in this way 560 livres Turkish. These acts took place during the first days of October last."

These extracts showed that in Constantinople it was perfectly notorious that these outrages were going on, and still we had Sir Henry Elliot pretending to know nothing about them, and keeping the Government at home in ignorance of facts which it was his business to know. The statements as to these atrocities might be in some degree exaggerated, but they were in the main authenticated by the names and dates which were given. But what said the Turkish defence which had been published. He would read portions of the summary of it that had appeared in *The Scotsman*—

> "The Turkish Embassy in London has issued the report of Edib Effendi, the Commissioner appointed by the Turkish Government to inquire into the alleged Bulgarian atrocities. He says the insurrection was extensively organized, and was to have broken out on May 1, but the date was anticipated by a few days. The towns of Philippopolis, Bazardjik, Adrianople, and Sofia were to be set on fire and plundered. The villages, which were the centre of the insurrection,

e fortified. Wooden cannon were prepared, the inhabitants had secreted all their valu- property. The Mussulman population who sed submission were to be put to death, as as their wives and children. In conse- nce of measures to suppress the insurrection d not spread, but 28 villages were burnt, of ch 18 were Christian and 4 were Mussulman. stories of Christian children being sold into ery arose simply from abandoned children ing been collected and cared for in the Mus- nan villages, most of whom have been re- ed to their homes. The cases in which nen were killed by the troops were due solely he obstinate resistance of the rebels. The ders of the insurrection, it is affirmed, were rywhere schoolmasters and village popes. s man finished up his report by the pious ex- ssion — There is nothing left but to pray Divine assistance in the work of restoring er."

thought a more contemptible thing the form of a defence never was laid fore a civilized community. In the arges against the Turkish Govern- nt there were names given. In this fence there was no case in which a me or date was mentioned. The de- nce confined itself entirely to the 1st of ay, or about that time, and said not a rd about the old atrocities. It said e insurrection was extensively orga- zed, and quoted a document found on me man who was killed. It did not ve the name of the man, nor the signa- res appended to the document. No- ing was stated that would permit the th of the statement to be tested. So r as he was concerned he had no hesi- tion in saying that this was a trumped- story, that there hardly was an insur- ction planned, that atrocities were ing on, until the people in a state of spair at a constant denial of justice, d a constant suffering which humanity uld no longer endure, made up their inds at last to some idea of insurrec- on, and then the flame was fanned in der that these atrocious Turks might ave an opportunity of coming down pon the people, and punishing them ost severely. He might dismiss that efence without further comment. But e atrocities were going on now. here was on Saturday in *The Daily ews* a statement of atrocities now tak- g place in Bosnia. What was called n insurrection in Bulgaria having been ut down by such atrocious means, was now being tried whether the ame means would have a similar effect Bosnia; and after the information e had received, and were receiving daily, and after the statements in *The Daily News*, it would not do to throw discredit upon them in the way that the Prime Minister so improperly did before. He would read some extracts from *The Daily News*—

> "A telegram from Vienna to the *Courrier de France* says that massacres have been committed by the Turks in Bosnia. In the villages of Pervan and Timar 300 Christians were drowned after being tortured. At Pavics 12 women were cut to pieces and thrown to the dogs. At Ratklovo 60 children were stoned by the Turks, led by one Fechim Effendi, to avenge a relation of Major Stocsvic Bey, killed at Bellina. At Sokelovo 180 young girls taken from the neighbouring villages were penned in a field, and after the prettiest had been picked out for the harems of Fechim and Stocsvic, the others were abandoned to the soldiery, and violated and murdered. At Maidan the Christian population assembled at market were massacred by a fanatical mob led by Hadji Omer Effendi, and another functionary named Ibrahim Kurusovics Aga. The victims in this case numbered 3,000. On July 21st there was another massacre at Pryedor under similar circumstances. All sorts of excesses by Bashi-Bazouks are reported from Brod. On the 12th and 13th a band of Bashi-Bazouks, numbering 600, pillaged and burned the village of Gens Mahalli on the railway between Adrianopole and Philippopolis. In the neighbourhood of Ismid Nicomeden there were similar atrocities."

Even allowing for exaggeration—as he was quite willing to do—the particularity of these statements, the names, and the dates given in them, showed that there must be much truth in them. But he came now to the statements in that day's *Daily News*, which spoke of atrocities exceeding any previously heard of. In this case, he did not see how it was possible to throw doubt on the statements, because they were sent by a correspondent accompanying the American Commissioner, Mr. Schuyler. He would repeat a few of these statements, which he was sure must have sent a thrill of horror through the heart of every one who had read them—

> "Mr. Baring will report 60 villages burnt. He is accompanied by a Turkish Guard, which frightens the people."

This was a serious difficulty in Mr. Baring's way, besides his ignorance of the Bulgarian language. Nobody doubted that he would do his best to get at the truth, but the doubt was as to whether he was in a position to get at the truth, whether he could inspire the peasantry with such confidence that they would come and tell him what was the real state of matters—

"The peasantry afterwards told M. Schuyler that they were afraid to come and testify."

That was most important—

"Proof has been obtained of atrocities corresponding in the majority of cases with the details of *The Daily News*. A schoolmistress, a beautiful girl, was arrested for embroidering a flag, and brutally maltreated."

Then they came to the town of Batok, where, on approaching the town on a hill, they saw a number of dogs who ran away, and they

"Found on the spot a number of skulls gathered about, and one ghastly heap of skeletons, with clothing. I counted from the saddle 100 skulls, picked and licked clean, all of women and children. We entered the town. On every side were skulls and skeletons, charred among the ruins, or lying entire where they fell in their clothing. There were skeletons of girls and women with long brown hair hanging to the skulls. We approached the church; there these remains were more frequent, until the ground was literally covered with skeletons, skulls, and putrefying bodies in clothing. Between the church and the school there were heaps. The stench was fearful. We entered the churchyard; the sight was more dreadful. The whole churchyard for 3 feet deep was festering with dead bodies partly covered—hands, legs, arms, and heads projected in ghastly confusion. I saw many little hands, heads, and feet of children of three years of age, and girls with heads covered with beautiful hair. The church was still worse. The floor was covered with rotting bodies, quite uncovered. I never imagined anything so fearful. There were 3,000 bodies in the churchyard and church. . . . In the school, a fine building, 200 women and children had been burnt alive. All over the town were the same scenes. . . . The man who did all this, Achmed Aga, has been promoted, and is still governor of the district. The newspaper accounts were not exaggerated. They could not be. No crime invented by Turkish ferocity was left uncommitted."

Hon. Members would know what that meant.

"The statement that the Bulgarians committed atrocities is utterly unfounded and shamefully false. M. Schuyler thinks that less than 200 Turks were killed, nearly all in open combat. There is no proof yet that a single Turkish woman or child was killed or violated."

He would not proceed further than to express his own horror at what he had read to the House. He was sure every hon. Member would feel upon the subject as strongly as he did. They would remember the cry of horror, he might say the cry of vengeance, that ran through the land at the tale of Cawnpore. Here was a tale far more bloody than that of Cawnpore. Cawnpore was exaggerated 10 or 20 times over in one town alone, and we might expect daily similar accounts from other towns of that unhappy country. Amid all this we stood by, and did nothing. There were only mild protestations from Sir Henry Elliot, who kept concealed from our Government at home his belief in, or knowledge of, these atrocities. There appeared to be a conspiracy of silence out there among officials and Ministers. They did not tell the Government exactly how matters stood, and we were giving our moral support to a nation that did such things as had been described. We sent our Fleet to Besika Bay without making any explanation why it was sent; and all the world had been left to believe that it was sent to give moral support to this vile nation of Turkey. All this must come to an end. He did not believe the people of this country would consent any longer to be on any terms with Turkey either of friendship or alliance. Her Majesty's Government would be required to take some stronger step than they had yet taken, and to make stronger representations than they had yet made, if possible in combination with other civilized nations in Europe, to put a complete stop to such horrible procedure. He thought nothing else would content the country, and he hoped the House would have that night some expressions from the Prime Minister of a very different kind from those he gave them on the last occasion when this subject was before the House.

Mr. MUNDELLA said, that as the result of a few words of protest he had uttered on a former occasion against the atrocities revealed in *The Daily News*, he had received letters of confirmation whose authenticity the Prime Minister, if he saw them, would not dispute. Had he known that the subject would have come before the House he would have had them with him. One was from Dr. Washbourne, the head of the American Missionaries' College in Constantinople, and one from Dr. Sandwith, enclosing letters from Bulgaria, from men for whose honour and truthfulness he could vouch. Some of these correspondents begged that nothing should be stated publicly that would at all enable the Turkish Government to identify them because such identification would be utter destruction to them. He (Mr. Mundella) had intended to give a Notice on this subject for Thursday, but he was glad his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) had anticipated

. He would not claim a monopoly
umanity for his side of the House.
believed every Englishman who read
accounts which had been quoted
ld feel, as he and his hon. Friend
in this matter—that it was horrible
t such crimes should be perpetrated
Europe by a Government with whom
were in alliance, and that believed it
supported by the power and strength
England. The Prime Minister, when
stioned on these Eastern events, had
ays said that his official information
not warrant these newspaper state-
nts, or that they were exaggerated.
mes of murder, arson, and outrage,
e rise to panic, and would always be
ewhat exaggerated; but where there
s such a mass of indisputable evidence
there was in this case, it was really
cking that an English Minister should
ak of these crimes as "inevitable."
at was an expression which, he con-
sed, caused him great pain. We were
w hearing more of these atrocities
m the newspapers, because they were
tter informed than Her Majesty's Go-
nment. Their correspondents, our
n countrymen, were on the spot, and
ny of them men of great reputation
own to all of them. They all knew
at *The Daily News* correspondence was
the Franco-German War, and how
gave the earliest information, and
ve it long before the Government gave
y. The enterprize of the Press out-
ipped the processes of Ministers, who
lieved in red tape, and who made these
mmon-place statements about exagge-
tions. That was simply the stereotyped
nguage of diplomacy. The mystery-
ongering of the Foreign Office never
ought out the truth unless the Press
d brought it straight to them long be-
re. Hence the doubt thrown by the Prime
inister on these statements. But they
d been borne out by the testimony of
. Schuyler and the concurrent testi-
ony of *The Times*, for what did *The*
imes' correspondent say? That gentle-
an described in glowing language the
agnificence of the country on the fron-
er of Servia, and remarked—

> "The Turk has blighted all. Such an exodus!
> ever since the flight of the Israelites had the
> ke of it been witnessed. I cannot command
> ords which will enable your readers to realize it."

gain, the same correspondent said—

> "I believe that, could all Europe have seen
> as I did yesterday, all Europe would rise in indignation. Thousands of Christians, the inhabitants of the villages along this frontier of Servia, were flying for their lives and for the honour of their wives and daughters from the cruel and remorseless Turk."

This was from a foreign correspondent of great ability, and writer of great reputation, and who had been relied upon for the best news over and over again, yet our Government sat still. He (Mr. Mundella) was not an advocate of war, but he said it was unworthy of England, if she had any power, or if she had any influence in the counsels of Europe, not to say to this "thing," which now was said to govern Turkey—whose Predecessor had died of the scissors, who was himself in the way of something worse, and whose probable successor was a fanatic—"Bring these things to an end, or we will point our guns at your palaces." England was once governed by a man named Cromwell, who in a case like this uttered words which brought massacres to an end. He prayed the Prime Minister to shake off the lethargy which had been too marked in this case, and to let them have some plain English speaking on the subject. It was too atrocious to be met with silence. We could not maintain these monsters any longer in Europe. It must not seem that we were maintaining them by our Fleet, as it apparently did to the ferocious ruffians who had actually appeared at the British Consulates demanding the wages of their guilt, in the belief that the English Consuls were to pay for what they had done. He spoke strongly, as he felt. It was time somebody spoke out, and that England awoke to a sense of her responsibility as a great Christian Power, and in the name of humanity did something to bring these things to an end.

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, it was much to be regretted that these inflammatory speeches should be made in that House. The speeches just delivered were exactly in the same style as a speech recently delivered at Willis's Rooms, in which the strongest opinions were expressed. Every one, and no one more than the Prime Minister himself, must mourn over the miseries attending civil war; but nobody could have read the Blue Book carefully without coming to the conclusion that these atrocities had been greatly magnified, and that they were not confined to one side. The responsibility for these events did not lie with our Ministry, but with those who instigated that war, and it was rather for them to try to mitigate these atrocities than for the Government of this country to interfere. He thought these speeches did the greatest harm. They were Party speeches against the Turkish Government, and the hon. Members opposite who delivered them should look at both sides of the question, and judge fairly and impartially between the two parties.

Mr. HAYTER urged the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to throw off official reticence on this subject, and say what had been done. From communications which he (Mr. Hayter) had received, he was assured that there had been no exaggeration whatever as to the number of these murders, and there really had been 12,000 persons murdered in Bulgaria. No doubt it was impossible for Her Majesty's Government to control the irregular troops of the Porte, but Her Majesty's Government would agree that the Porte was responsible for whatever irregular troops the Porte took into its employ. On this point he might cite the answer of General Liprandi to Lord Raglan. During the Crimean War Lord Raglan begged General Liprandi not to allow the Cossacks to murder and plunder English officers who were wounded and lying on the ground; and General Liprandi replied—"I can keep in order the disciplined troops of Russia, but I cannot control the Cossacks, who are obliged to be used by the Russian Government in their extremity, and who are obliged to make up by plunder for the want of pay." Now, the Bashi-Bazouks probably received no pay, and there was in the printed Papers a letter from the Pasha in some of the disturbed districts in Bosnia, stating that he would not be responsible for the irregular troops unless the Turkish Government sent out some pay for them. He himself had seen irregular Turkish troops in a state of mutiny, and officers going down on their knees begging the men to obey orders. As to the Bulgarians, he had travelled in that country, and was prepared to say that the peasantry were among the most inoffensive people in the world. A large settlement of Circassians had been set down by the side of them, and probably to these Circassians part of the atrocities were due. But they were aided by the troops of a European Power, and it was this fact of which Her Majesty's Government ought to take account. It would be very easy for the right hon. Gentleman to rise at the close of this debate and say—"What do you want me to do?" Well, he, for one, intended to insist that Her Majesty's Government ought to use all their diplomatic power to insist on the withdrawal of the Bashi-Bazouks from these Provinces, to insist that the families of these murdered men were compensated, and that the Turkish Government should give an assurance that these irregular troops should not be employed to put down insurrection. When they had done that Her Majesty's Government would have done something to put down these disgraceful outrages.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR believed that in the House and out of the House the people were indebted to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) for again directing the attention of Parliament to atrocities which he (Mr. Taylor) would not say were never equalled in the history of the world, but which neither in modern, nor ancient times were ever surpassed. His only regret was that the Forms of the House did not enable him to frame the observations he had made in a distinctive Motion, because it was essential before separating for the Recess that representation should be made in that House of the feelings of shame and indignation which rushed through every heart in this Realm. The House of Commons and the country were disappointed that in the references to these atrocities, from the Government bench the Prime Minister did all he could to throw a slur on the correctness of the reports given by correspondents, and to show that these were the ordinary consequences of civil war. The right hon. Gentleman would be glad of the opportunity given him that night to set himself right with the country. The House of Commons and the country knew very well that the excuses of the Turkish Government were not valid in the slightest degree, but rested on absolute falsehood. Atrocities had been going on, and were going on at the present moment, of an almost unparalleled character. Red Indians in the American wilds scalped their victims, but never did what these fiends in stern Europe were doing. The right n. Gentleman on a late occasion had erred to Jamaica. He (Mr. Taylor) l never been disposed to say less of atrocities in Jamaica than they deved, for he, with others, did his best bring Governor Eyre to justice for the rders done there; but it was a libel Governor Eyre to compare what was ne in Jamaica with the savage and obne atrocities of the Turks in Europe. answer to the question—" What is to done?" he thought the first thing was recognize the crime. It might be said at could we do? There was a galnt old gentleman in this country (Lord ssell)—he (Mr. Taylor) wished he re at the head of the Government w—who might not, as had been said, ke command of the Fleet at an hour's tice, but who would assuredly not have lowed the name of England to be agged into the atrocities now going n. He trusted some Member of the vernment would clear this country of e shame that attached to it in connecon with these occurrences.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT held that a ry strong case had been made out ainst the Turkish Government in resct to the horrible atrocities committed Bulgaria, and that much blame was e to Her Majesty's Government, who, ther from ignorance or apathy, had emed rather to palliate than to endeaour to check these crimes. It had been id that there was much exaggeration, ut he thought it was almost impossible here could have been much exaggeraon. The correspondents of our leading aily newspapers who made the facts ublic wrote with the full knowledge hat everything that appeared in the ress would be subject to severe critism, and if untrue would be denied. It as impossible that gentlemen of their osition and experience could send these ccounts unless they were aware of the acts. The language of his hon. Friend he Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) ad been strong, but in his opinion was ot too strong for a case such as this. he hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anerson) referred to the presence of a ritish Fleet in Besika Bay. He did not now for what purpose the Fleet was ent there, and what it was expected to o, but as it was there, he believed it ould gladden the hearts of the English eople to learn that it could lend some influence to the representations of our Government in favour of the cause of humanity in Europe. If we had never interfered in Turkish affairs the position would not be quite the same, but we always had been interfering in the affairs of Turkey, and indeed half the nations of Europe were deliberating upon the affairs of that country and claiming the right to interfere. That being the case, it was a scandal to Europe that such atrocities should take place within her borders. He hoped that one result of the discussion which had been raised would be to quicken the conscience of Her Majesty's Government, and if they had not yet made vigorous efforts to stop these terrible scenes, that in future at least the country would not have cause to complain of their remissness.

MR. WHITWELL said, the House was still uninformed of the purpose of the Fleet being at Besika Bay. Before the debate closed he hoped they would be informed. It was said to be there to protect the Christians and prevent disturbances, but if that were so, what had been the result? He feared it was there in a bad cause, for the Christians were unprotected, and the disturbances were still going on. He hoped the Government would not allow the debate to close without intimating that every power that England possessed would be exercised to cause a cessation of these terrible calamities and cruelties.

MR. J. COWEN said, that when the statement of these atrocities was first made known in this country he communicated with correspondents in Constantinople, and within the last few days had been assured that not only were the reports accurate, but were understated. A general impression prevailed among the English residents in Constantinople that our Ambassador there displayed unnecessary Turkish leanings, and, further, that, with the best intentions and unquestionable capacity, his health was such that he was not in a position to afford the Government at home accurate and detailed information.

MR. BOURKE said, before dealing with the very serious matter which they had just been discussing, he wished to refer to the present condition of the Stockholm church, as brought under the notice of the House by the hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr.

Beresford Hope). There seemed to be a misapprehension as to some of the facts. For instance, the church did not belong exclusively to British subjects, but to the English-speaking community, and as there was a Protestant community, the Government did not think it necessary to maintain a Consular chaplain. When he was withdrawn, a committee of the congregation elected a chaplain of their own, but after a time he resigned. He then wished to withdraw his resignation, but was not allowed to do so. All official connection on the part of the Government with the church having ceased, the committee succeeded in getting another chaplain, and the original chaplain protested against these proceedings, and called a meeting, which was attended by others than British subjects. Another committee was appointed, representing the whole congregation, and a dispute commenced between it and the old committee, representing British subjects alone. The Law Officers of the Crown had advised Her Majesty's Government that they ought not to interfere, and it was thought better to leave the settlement of the matter to the parties interested. He did not think they could recede from the position which the Government had taken up; and as to the Swedish Government breaking open the church in process of law, nothing offensive was intended. He hoped—and he could not do more than this—that the termination of this unhappy quarrel would be reached at as early a date as possible. He came now to the subject which had been introduced by the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson), and he was sure that it would be admitted that, whatever were the reasons for bringing the case before the House on the present occasion, that course was attended with some amount of inconvenience. He had only received two hours' notice of the matter, and therefore he was not in a position to refer to the documents which were in the Blue Book bearing on this subject, with a view to their explanation. Still, although inconvenient, he could not in the least be surprised, after what had occurred, at any hon. Member bringing the subject forward. He regretted in the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member to hear at the very outset of his speech a statement which was totally unfounded. The hon. Member said that in the discussion of this question, when before the House, the Prime Minister treated it with a degree of levity. He knew just the reverse was the case, because he had been ordered by the Prime Minister to be in daily communication with him on the subject; and he (Mr. Bourke) stated this, upon his honour, that there was no subject connected with foreign affairs that had given his right hon. Friend such cause for anxious consideration as the question now before the House. The gravity of the subject made it advisable and absolutely necessary that a man who occupied the position of his right hon. Friend in Europe should talk of these atrocities with the greatest possible circumspection, because if one word of exaggeration was used by him, it might be made an excuse in answer to any representations made by him to the Turkish Government. It, therefore, was incumbent on his right hon. Friend, in dealing with these horrible atrocities, in the first place to find out the exact truth; and he was perfectly certain there was no man in the world, if these atrocities turned out to be true, that would more sternly vindicate the cause of humanity than his right hon. Friend at the head of the Government. The hon. Member for Glasgow had also made an attack on the Minister at Constantinople, and a more unjust attack never was made. If he (Mr. Bourke) had before him the Papers which were discussed last week, he could have shown that long before the subject was mentioned in the daily papers Sir Henry Elliot brought this subject to the notice of the Turkish Government, and went at once to the bottom of the matter. He at once said that so long as the Circassians and Bashi-Bazouks were employed, he was afraid irregularities would occur; and Sir Henry Elliot spoke in this spirit before a single outrage was heard of. In a letter contained in the Blue Book Sir Henry Elliot wrote to Lord Derby (in a private letter, I think)—

> "For once that I have made these reports to your Lordship, I have spoken a dozen times to the Turkish Government."

There could not be the slightest doubt, therefore, that a word could not be said justly against Sir Henry Elliot for any breach of duty or want of energy in this matter. He was not going to say one word as to whether everything t had appeared in *The Daily News* s true or not; but that was exactly position which was assumed by his ht hon. Friend at the head of the vernment. [An hon. MEMBER: Exag- ated.] His right hon. Friend read ounts from Adrianople, and he said t in certain cases they were very ch exaggerated. He (Mr. Bourke) not wish to join issue with anybody the subject whether they were exag- ated or not; he did not think, so far the effect on the minds of the English ple was concerned, it mattered whe- r 100 persons had been killed or 50; these atrocities had been committed anything like the numbers stated, r Majesty's Government, of course, re bound to do everything they pos- ly could to prevent their recurrence, l to punish the guilty. When they, wever, talked of the Fleet in Besika y, and remembered that these atro- es were committed in Bulgaria, he st remind hon. Members that the matters had little in common. Why, Fleet could not reach Bulgaria— r. MUNDELLA: It could reach Con- ntinople.] There was no necessity that in order to make representations the Turkish Government. They could ercise moral compulsion without the ervention of the Fleet. With regard to at the hon. Member had said respect- g newspaper correspondents, he ad- tted that newspaper correspondents re persons of the greatest possible nsideration, but he also knew that in ne cases correspondents were easily isfied with a very small amount of idence, and they took a great deal at cond-hand; and they knew that taking tements at second-hand was a very ngerous mode of ascertaining the truth. for the letters which had been read by n. Members, they were of no greater thority than the declarations of any her hon. Gentleman sitting in that ouse—that was to say, the statements them were not the declarations of rsons who had seen the thing them- lves, and they all knew that when one an went and told another that some rrible thing had taken place, particu- rly where numbers were concerned, at the exaggeration was very great. owever, he did not wish to weigh the atements of one correspondent against nother. All he would say was that er Majesty's Government had not shown the least apathy with regard to the subject, and from the first they had done the very best they could. Now, what had been done? [*Ironical cheers.*] The very first time they heard of these outrages they telegraphed for information to Sir Henry Elliot, and afterwards they instructed him to have inquiries made on the spot. Some of the official Reports received had been already presented to Parliament; others had come to hand within the last three or four days, and the other day he had mentioned to the House that Mr. Baring and another gentleman had been sent from Constantinople to make inquiries. Mr. Baring had lost not one moment in making these inquiries, and he had before him a Paper which would be presented to the House in the course of a very few days. With regard to others that might arrive in connection with the subject, he believed he might say, although he had no authority to do so, that his noble Friend at the head of the Foreign Office would take means to have Reports published during the Recess, if he thought they would be interesting to the public. It was impossible to read all the Papers on the subject, but he hoped they would be in the hands of hon. Members in a few days. All he would read was one letter from Mr. Baring. He would do so in order to show that the Government had done whatever they could in the matter, and the House might form their own opinion upon it. But before doing so he would refer to the article in that day's *Daily News*, because he observed that some disparagement was thrown upon Mr. Baring therein, and also upon the interpreter who accompanied him. The remark to which he alluded was that Mr. Baring was honestly desirous of obtaining the truth, but that he was always accompanied by a Turkish escort which frightened the peasantry. But what other escort than a Turkish escort could Mr. Baring have? It was absolutely necessary for him to have a Turkish escort. The article went on to say that Mr. Guacchiomo, the interpreter, was unfairly prejudiced in favour of the Turks and that he browbeat the Bulgarians. He was sorry to say that that at once stamped the whole thing with a partizan character, and, to his mind, took away from the value of the report, because he could never imagine that Mr.

Baring would allow his interpreter either to browbeat or to bully the Bulgarians, or to show the slightest preference for Turks over Bulgarians. The letter from Mr. Baring was—

"Philippopolis, July 22, 1876.

"Sir,—I have the honour to report to your Excellency that, during the last two days I have been endeavouring to obtain information in this town respecting the occurrences which have of late excited so much attention in England and elsewhere. The masses of conflicting statements I have heard from all parties render my mission one of extreme difficulty, and I fear I cannot as yet forward to your Excellency any full report of what has taken place. The sale of women and children in the streets of Philippopolis and Tartar Bazardjik is, I have no doubt, a pure invention; the most independent testimony leads me to the belief that no such traffic has been carried on here. What has happened is this—families have been scattered, and the children have often been taken into the houses of persons of all religions out of pure charity. Of course, under the circumstances, it is not easy for the parents to trace them, and consequently the rumour goes abroad that they are sold into slavery. As regards the young girls, I am told that it is very probable that after the sack of the villages a certain number of their number were taken to the houses of their captors, but I do not believe that anything like open sale took place. There is not, I believe, one word of truth in the wild fable about the cartloads of heads being paraded in the streets by Albanian Bashi-Bazouks, of whom, by the way, there are extremely few, most of the Irregulars who committed the atrocities in these Provinces being Circassians, Gipsies, and Pomaks. As regards the number of killed, till I visited the villages I hardly dare speak, but my present opinion, which I trust hereafter to be able to modify, is that about 12,000 Bulgarians have perished. The number of Turks killed is equally difficult to ascertain; the authorities put the figure at above 1,000, but my information leads me to believe this to be a gross exaggeration; about half that number would probably be correct; but there is no doubt that the deaths of many of them were attended with circumstances of great cruelty. Some 60 villages have been wholly or partially burnt, by far the greater portion of them by the Bashi-Bazouks, though a few, perhaps about ten, have been destroyed by the Insurgents. Some great horrors have come to my ears respecting the circumstances which attended the entry into Philippopolis of 400 prisoners coming from Tartar Bazardjik. They were heavily chained by fours, and, as after their journey they were sinking with fatigue, they were driven like cattle by the zaptiehs, who used the butt ends of their guns without mercy, while the Circassians flogged them with whips. I visited the prisons yesterday and found them extremely crowded. The captives are confined in the common prison and in two large Khans, the notables of Philippopolis being kept separate, and being subjected, as far as I could see, to no great discomfort. Those that I interrogated said that they had no particular cause of complaint as regards food and treatment, though, perhaps, fear may have made them declare their case to be better than it really is. The prison is now about as full as it can hold, and about half the prisoners have been released or sentenced, so that there can be no doubt that at the commencement the overcrowding must have been something fearful. I hear that it is currently reported in the town that the authorities knowing I was going to the prison had it cleaned out, and that the sleeping mats I saw were laid down shortly before I entered. Of course, I cannot say whether this is true or not, but as I purposely gave the authorities as little notice as possible of my intentions, I cannot but think it is invention of the malicious. A Bashi-Bazouk was hung this morning for having taken part in the Hasskeni affair, respecting which I believe Mr. Dupuis has fully reported to your Excellency. The depredations of these Irregulars still continue, and they are taking what little was left by those who suppressed the insurrection. Two have now been hung here, but till a much severer example is made they will still go on with their misdeeds.—Moreover, it is indispensable that they should have officers of the Regular Army put over them who could control their acts, and that when they arrive at the principal stations they should be received by some Regular troops. One thing is perfectly clear, viz., that the Province is ruined, as the Government will discover to its cost when the tithe is collected. It is stated that the loss to the Treasury will amount to £100,000 Turkish—a sum which can now be ill spared. It seems to me that there is but one course open to the Government if it wishes to bring them back in any way to their normal condition, viz., to give some slight aid to the inhabitants of the villages which have been destroyed. Large numbers of horses, oxen, sheep and cows have been driven off by Pomaks and others, and it is the duty of the Government to oblige the latter to return them to their owners; a little help could also be given in providing materials for rebuilding houses, and seed for the fields, should also be given. It is true that at the present moment the Imperial Treasury could ill afford the smallest strain, but still less can it afford to lose the sums which formerly flowed into it from these districts, and which, if the autumn and winter be allowed to pass without anything being done, may be considered as lost for ever. I was present to-day at the first examinations of some of the prisoners, and to all appearances the proceedings were properly conducted, and Salim Effendi, Ali Bey, and the Chief Mollah of Adrianople have the reputation of being just men; the same, however, is not said of all the members of the Commission chosen among the natives of Philippopolis, one of whom has been especially mentioned to me as corrupt, fanatical, and cruel. A priest, a schoolmaster, a 'Tchorbaji,' and another Bulgarian were brought up while I was in Court; their declarations were read over to them, and they were asked whether the contents were true; and, though all contained evidence which would send a man to the gallows before any Tribunal, they invariably replied that everything was correct. Their defence was generally the same; they had acted as they had done either from coercion, fear, or sheer stupidity.

they ended by begging for mercy with tears lamentations. To-day two Bulgarians were g, four sentenced to death, and seven to rent terms of imprisonment. Both Kiani a and Salim Effendi have assured me that few days by releasing a large number of oners they hoped to reduce the cases to be l to about 500, and the President added that bout 25 days he trusted all would be disposed The Bulgarian Bishop's representative comhed to me that the prisoners sentenced to h were not permitted to confer in private, no notice was sent to them when a man was e hung, and that when priests were executed r beards and hair were cut off, and they were unfrocked; also that he was not asked to nd the sittings of the Commission. Salim ndi, to whom I spoke on the subject, posily denied the truth of all these statements, said that to-day he had, by verbal message, ted the Bishop's representative to attend sitting at which I was present, but that he not come. On other occasions also he was ted, but he only attended once and stayed minutes. I told Salim Effendi that the t time he had better send the invitation in ing, as there could then be no mistake about Salim Effendi told me that he had sent ies of the depositions to Constantinople, ch he said contained startling evidence given prisoners themselves respecting the great elties committed on Mussulmans at the outak of the insurrection, and if what he says is rect, it appears to me that the Porte would well to publish these documents, in order to ve to the world that if the Mussulmans comted atrocities and depredations, the Christians e also guilty of many foul deeds.—I have, &c., BARING."—[*Turkey*, No. 5 (1876), No, 27.]

thought, after that, that the House uld be satisfied that Mr. Baring was ing his duty well and efficiently, for did not think that anybody could ad that letter without seeing that Mr. ring did not wish to keep back anyng, and that he was doing his duty no spirit of partizanship one way or e other. He could not imagine how spirit of partizanship had crept into e discussion; but, after all, that was t the matter they had to consider. He as quite certain that there was not a an in the House who did not feel the avity of the subject of these atrocities, d no man felt it more than the Prime inister. He therefore thought the ouse would be willing to leave the atter now in the hands of Her Majesty's overnment, feeling perfectly certain at measures would be taken to bring ose atrocities to an end and their perpetrators to justice. He wished to read e following passage from these papers ith reference to the proclamation sued by the Grand Vizier:—

"The Grand Vizier has addressed the followg telegraphic order to the Governors General of the Provinces of Adrianople, the Danube, Bosnia, and Monastir, and to Abdul-Kerim Pasha, the Generalissimo of the Turkish forces, at Head-Quarters at Nish. The telegram is dated the 25th inst. (Tuesday last):—'I have just learnt that there are, among the volunteers of the Army Corps at Widdin, men who have sold as slaves children of both sexes, of which they obtained possession during their expedition into Servia. This is an act which I formally reprove, and its authors must not escape the punishment it entails. Henceforth, all persons who shall sell or buy children of either sex, whether coming from Servia or any other place, shall be immediately punished with the penalty of death. Those who may have bought children of this kind are summoned to give them up to the local authorities within a given period, and all contraveners of these orders will be condemned to death. Those who are found to be going to the war for the purpose of committing acts of outrage and pillage will be at once sent back to their homes. You are requested to give publicity to these decisions by printed proclamation, and to use every possible vigilance in carrying them into execution."

Her Majesty's Government, after the Reports they had received, would, of course, take the matter into their serious consideration; but it would involve a considerable amount of thought how the influence of that House, of the people of England, and, he might say, of all the friends of humanity, should be brought to bear on the scenes where those acts had occurred, and he thought the House would agree with him that if the Government were to attempt anything like force, it would at once lead to complications in Europe which might be the cause of greater barbarities than any which had hitherto taken place. We must take care that these atrocious acts were not taken advantage of to carry out a policy hostile to England as well as to Turkey. The hon. Member for Glasgow had spoken of there having been no Bulgarian insurrection at all; but they would find that the insurrection not only had not suddenly sprung up, but that for months and months it had been extending; and, dreadful as those atrocities had been, there was no doubt that the Bulgarians would not have been disturbed in the prosperity they were enjoying only 10 months ago if it had not been for the machinations of those persons who were the first to produce the insurrection. He would not say who those persons were, but would leave hon. Members to judge for themselves when they saw the Papers.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has complained that there has been a disposition in this and other questions to give them a partizan character; but I am sure there is no disposition in the House to make this in any degree a Party question; and if it has in any degree assumed a Party aspect, I cannot think it has been the fault of, or that it is felt to be so, by hon. Members who sit on this side. It was quite unnecessary for the hon. Gentleman to disclaim for the Government, and for the head of the Government, any possible sympathy with the perpetrators of those outrages. No such idea ever entered the mind of any hon. Gentleman. But what was felt when the first Questions were asked on this subject was, that Her Majesty's Government seemed to be rather unwilling to believe the charges brought against a friendly Power, and too ready to lend credence to the representations of that Power, and did not take sufficiently prompt and energetic measures to ascertain what was the real state of the case, and then to remonstrate with the Government that was responsible for it. From the statement which the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bourke) has been able make this evening, and from the contents of the Papers which are to be laid on the Table, I am afraid it is becoming apparent that after all there has been very little exaggeration of these atrocities; and the House must recollect that the despatch which my hon. Friend has read, full as that despatch was of horrible accounts of what had taken place, was not of nearly so late a date as the despatches of *The Daily News* upon this subject. The despatch the hon. Member read was dated July 22nd, and the accounts which have been sent to *The Daily News* are dated July 31st and August 3rd. We are most of us tolerably well aware of the responsible character of the gentlemen who are employed by the London newspapers upon missions such as that upon which the correspondent of *The Daily News* is employed, and if it were necessary I have no doubt there are many hon. Gentleman in this House who could say they are personally acquainted with the gentleman who represents *The Daily News* in Turkey, and who would testify to the general trustworthiness of the statements he may make. It is hardly credible that, while apparently personally accompanying Mr. Baring, this newspaper correspondent should misrepresent the things that he had himself seen. It is quite possible that a newspaper correspondent may be misled by reports that are brought to him; it is quite possible also that he may give an exaggerated colour to those reports; but it is hardly conceivable that a gentleman representing an important and influential English paper would be guilty of any mis-statement, which could be very shortly contradicted, of those things that he had seen with his own eyes. Therefore, Sir, I fear that in the accounts that have been given by the correspondent of *The Daily News* there is very little, if any, exaggeration whatever, and there is very little reason to hope that there was any reason for exaggerating them. But what can we have more frightful than the statement in the despatch just read to us that Mr. Baring has very little doubt but that 12,000 Bulgarians have perished? We have heard nothing of any severe fighting in Bulgaria. Sir Henry Elliot has not made Her Majesty's Government acquainted with any severe fighting there. If, therefore, Mr. Baring has come to the conclusion that something like 12,000 Bulgarians have perished in the insurrection, is there not reason to fear that the greater part of that number have been massacred in cold blood? There is every excuse for Her Majesty's Government having desired to receive favourably the representations made by a friendly Power, but I think the House has some right to ask for explanations from them as to the reason why they have not hitherto been better informed on this subject. It seems to me, I must say, a remarkable thing, when there has been slaughter of this description—I do not say whether in cold blood or not—in one of the Provinces of Turkey, that no intelligence of these atrocities should have reached Sir Henry Elliot. Reference has been made to despatches which were laid on the Table a short time ago, and I may, perhaps, be allowed to refer to one or two of those despatches. On July 6 writing to Lord Derby, Sir Henry Ellio says that with reference to the excesses committed in the suppression of the insurrection, there had undoubtedly been great excesses, as was inevitable from the nature of the Force which the Porte was obliged to employ, but that it was equally certain that the details which

re given, coming as they did almost
lusively from Russian and Bulgarian
rces, were so monstrously exagge-
ed as to deprive them of credit. Now,
an hardly think if Sir Henry Elliot
been in possession of anything like
urate information, such as that con-
hed in Mr. Baring's Report, that
se are the terms in which he
uld have written of those atro-
es. On the 14th of July Sir Henry
iot reported that he had an interview
h a Bulgarian, on whom he could
y, who assured him that the accounts
lished were grossly exaggerated. It
s appear to me that Sir Henry Elliot
s not possess the means which he
ght to possess of being made aware
what is going on in the Provinces of
rkey. If Sir Henry Elliot had had at
disposal more full and trustworthy
urces of information, I cannot help
nking a knowledge of these proceed-
gs would sooner have reached his
s, and through him the English
vernment; and I cannot help thinking
at had the right hon. Gentleman at
head of the Government been in
ssession of the evidence which ought
have reached him he would not have
ated the first Question on this subject
the manner he did. I trust my hon.
iend will endeavour to have these
pers laid on the Table with as little
lay as possible, so that it may be in
power of the House, if necessary,
have one more opportunity before it
parates of expressing its opinion upon
ese matters. My hon. Friend said it
uld be a matter of grave considera-
n how the influence of the House, the
vernment, and the people of this
untry can be brought to bear upon
e Turkish Government. It may be
matter for the Government to consider
w the influence of the Government
d of Parliament is to be brought to
ar, but there can be no doubt what-
er that the influence of this people
s been brought to bear, and will
om day to day be brought to bear
ore strongly upon the Turkish Go-
rnment. In this way the Turkish Go-
rnment will know it, and the sooner
r Government represent to them the
tter, that unless some complete de-
nce against these terrible atrocities
n be put forward, the Turkish Govern-
ent will lose as it has lost, and is
pidly daily losing, all traces of the
sympathy previously shown it. I do trust that the influence of the Government will be exerted to make known these facts to the Turkish Government. I do not think that even the Turkish Government can consider a fact of this nature an unimportant matter. To be deprived of the sympathy of a country like England, which has always to the best of its ability befriended Turkey, cannot be matter of indifference to the Turkish Government. I do not think it is possible for the Government to speak in too strong terms of the conduct of the Turkish Government, and of the course which it is too clear has been taken during the continuance and in the suppression of this insurrection.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions [August 5] *reported.*

First Seven Resolutions *agreed to.*

The Eighth Resolution read a second time.

PERU—THE CASE OF THE "TALISMAN."

RESOLUTION.

Dr. CAMERON, in rising to move the reduction of the Vote by £2,000, being the amount of the salary of the British Minister Resident and Consul General in Peru, said, he did so on account of the conduct of our Representatives in Peru in connection with the *Talisman* case. The points of that case were briefly these—the *Talisman*, a British steamer, manned by British subjects, was chartered by some evil-disposed persons for the secret purpose of carrying munitions of war and a band of revolutionists into Peru, with the view of there raising a revolution. The revolutionists embarked at a Chilian port, and it was not till they were at sea and off the coast of Peru that they declared themselves in their true colours, armed themselves, and took possession of the vessel. They ordered the vessel into Pacasmayo Bay, where the captain went ashore, accompanied by the second mate and three sailors. They were at once taken prisoners, and it was not till after the capture that the first act of violence and overt insurrection was committed. This consisted in the insurgents firing upon some soldiers who were sent to take the ship and driving them off. The insurgents then, with arms in their hands, compelled the crew to run the vessel out of Pacasmayo southwards along the coast till they arrived at Ylo, where the vessel and crew were taken prisoners by the Peruvian iron-clad *Huascar* on the 2nd November, 1874, the insurgents making their escape up country. The vessel was at once brought before the Peruvian Prize Courts, but was not condemned till June, 1875, nor was an appeal lodged in the case disposed of till December, 1875. But in December, 1874, she was most irregularly and illegally employed by the Peruvian Government as a troopship. The crew were at first impressed by the Peruvian authorities in Peruvian ships of war engaged on active service, and were, on the suppression of the insurrection which rendered their services valuable, sent to prison, where, after an illegal detention for 12 months, they were liberated without trial, on the ground that there was not sufficient ground for handing them over to the criminal authorities. The captain and two mates were, however, handed over to the criminal authorities for trial. After a delay in instituting proceedings against them, which, under Peru's Treaty obligations to us, entitled them to be set free, proceedings were instituted against them. Before, however, they had gone far, Sibley, the first mate, was assassinated in prison. In April last the captain and second mate were subjected to a mock trial. He (Dr. Cameron) used the phrase advisedly, for he was in a position to know that on the 24th of March the Foreign Office was in possession of information to the effect that, if the captain and second mate were found guilty, they would be sentenced to a year's banishment from Peru. They were found guilty, and were so sentenced, and a telegram received on April 22nd announced the fact to the Foreign Office. But the fact that the sentence was known nearly a month before the conclusion of the trial shows that the whole thing was a foregone conclusion. Well, an appeal lodged by Haddock upset this arrangement, which, under ordinary circumstances, would have been not unsatisfactory. King, the second mate, took no part in the appeal, and protested against it; but it was held that his case having been conjoined with those of Haddock and the two Perierolists who were tried along with them, could not be separated from them, and that he must be held as conjoined in the appeal and its consequences. The injustice of this was so flagrant that, on June 7, Lord Derby wrote a very strong despatch to Peru, demanding that King should at once be surrendered. By this time the Supreme Court in Peru had pronounced judgment in the appeal case virtually confirming the sentence of banishment. On this occasion none of the prisoners appealed, so that the Peruvian Government might, with the most perfect dignity, have complied with the demand for King's liberation; but now the Peruvian authorities stepped in with an appeal, and the result was that after one year and ten months' imprisonment the fate of these wretched men was still undecided. Till their liberation had been obtained one did not like to stir the question of compensation either for the illegal detention of the crew or the murder of Sibley. For the delay that had occurred he held the Representatives of Great Britain in Peru to be to a great degree responsible, and it was for this reason that he proposed the reduction of the Vote before the House. Had our Representatives kept Government fully and promptly advised of the various circumstances of the case he was certain that this country would have interfered long ago, at a time when its interference would have been much more effective. The first incident which it was the duty of the British Minister to report was the outrage on the British flag, which was perpetrated when the *Talisman*, six months before condemnation, was used by the Peruvians as a Government transport. This outrage Mr. March, had reported, but it was accompanied by the wholesale impressment of British subjects forming the crew of the *Talisman* into the naval service of Peru. Three men were impressed on board the gunboat *Chalico*, and actually put into Peruvian uniform. The rest of the crew were kept for five weeks after their capture on board the iron-clad *Huascar*, while that vessel was engaged on active service connected with the suppression of the insurrection in the south; they were worked exactly like the vessel's own crew, and the one distinction made was that they received no pay. The engineer was impressed to work the engines of the *Talisman* when she was employed as a Government transport. And yet this pressment was the only one alluded in the despatches sent home by our presentatives, and that in connection ely with the employment of the vessel ore her condemnation. The impressnt of British sailors on board foreign r ships appeared to him a most serious tter, one regarding which the Repre ntatives of our country should have efully informed themselves and re rted to the Foreign Office. Instead of s not one word was to be found in the pers recently laid before the House out the impressment of these men, either board the *Huascar* or the *Chalico*. Then e crew had been illegally detained for a ar against the Peruvian Constitution d against Peru's Treaty obligations to is country, on an extraordinary opinion the Peruvian Attorney General—that e sailor witnesses and documents in a ize case both came under the category productions, and that they must be tained in custody of the Prize Court ntil the conclusion of the case. This traordinary opinion was allowed not ly to over-ride the opinion of the Judge the Court—who desired to set the en at liberty—but Peru's Treaty obli ations to this country, under which the en were entitled to be brought to trial ithout delay or else to be liberated. nd yet our Representatives in Peru, as r as could be seen from the Papers id before Parliament, had said not one ord on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER reminded the hon. ember that the matter to which he as referring had formed the subject of long debate in the earlier part of the ession, and that it was out of Order enter into a fresh discussion on the atter unless it distinctly referred to the eduction of the Vote immediately before he House.

Dr. CAMERON replied that his in ention was to show that the British epresentative in Peru had not kept er Majesty's Government informed re arding many material points in the case, hich, had they been known, would have ad an important effect on our national olicy in the matter, and his argument ould be directed to show that for this eason the Vote might be curtailed ithout disadvantage to the efficiency f our diplomatic service. He accused r. St. John, doubtless through insufficient information, but it was his duty o have sufficiently informed himself, of having misled the Government on various material points. Thus, in reply to complaints as to the prison of Casa Matas, in a despatch dated August 25, Mr. St. John had spoken of it as spacious and airy, though very gloomy. In reality, its state was such a scandal that the Peruvians themselves very shortly afterwards condemned it, and on October 19th Mr. St. John was obliged very materially to modify his previous picture, and to admit that the cells had been lately unequivocally condemned by one of the principal Judges, and that they were totally unfit to be used as a gaol. Again, a great aggravation in the condition of the prisoners was to be found in the character of the desperadoes with whom they were locked up. This had been misrepresented by Mr. St. John, and it was not until Sibley had been murdered by a fellow-prisoner that the complaints which he (Dr. Cameron) had so often made on the subject were credited. As the circumstances of Sibley's murder were not known in this country, and as rumour had been circulated that they were in some manner discreditable to the murdered man, he would briefly describe them. He held in his hand various declarations on the subject—one made by the warder of Casa Matas to the Criminal Judge; one from Bell, a prisoner whose hard case was familiar to everyone who had read Papers recently laid before the House; one from Izatt, the mate of a Liverpool vessel, who for some trifling indiscretion which he had committed while on shore, had been placed in gaol and kept there for the last eight or nine months, and from others, and they all agreed as to the facts of the case. An Equadorian prisoner named Viteri had attempted to take up his quarters in a room occupied by Sibley and a Spanish prisoner named Mourgan. Mourgan complained to the warder, and Viteri was ordered out. He shortly after returned and assaulted Mourgan. Sibley interfered to protect him, whereupon Viteri struck him three times. At last Sibley struck him back in self-defence, upon which Viteri drew a knife and stabbed Sibley in several places. The warder of the prison added to his account of the affair the statement that Sibley had always conducted himself well and peaceably, whereas Viteri was notoriously a man of bad character. He might add that he had been informed that Viteri had been sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment for the murder; that he was regarded by his mates as quite a hero for having killed an Englishman; and that, in order to add to his laurels, he threatened to do for King, the second mate, on the first opportunity. The case for the two men still in prison was very strong. In the first place, neither of them having been *in flagrante delicto*, they were clearly entitled to the protection provided for under the Treaty to which he had before referred. They, in common with the rest, had been illegally detained for 12 months pending the settlement of the prize case. Even after they were handed over to the criminal authorities another delay had occurred, such as entitled them under the Treaty to be set free. King's case was especially strong; he had been one of those against whom the Peruvian Government had so little to urge that he was promised his liberation. He had accepted the sentence of banishment, and was only too anxious to get away. But even in this case the baneful influence of our diplomatic Representative had been felt, for even here he found the Peruvian Attorney General of the Supreme Court urging in his appeal of May 5, as a reason why a more serious sentence should be pronounced upon the prisoners—

> "That he had heard the diplomatic Representative of England remark that he also understood that the *Talisman* could only be considered a pirate,"

and that, if that gentleman was of that opinion, it was clear that a much heavier sentence was demanded than that which had been pronounced. In conclusion, the hon. Member remarked that he had carefully abstained from going into the merits of the case so as to provoke any expression regarding them which might prejudice the cause of the prisoners still in Peru. He had confined himself strictly to the legal aspect of the case, and to the Vote before the House. They had it, on the authority of the Peruvian Government, that although this country had considered it its duty to interfere diplomatically in the case, its interference had resulted in nothing, as the case had gone on precisely as if no such interference had taken place. If they could do no good, he begged them to beware of doing harm by entering into unnecessary and useless arguments; to overturn conclusions which the Peruvian authorities and Courts themselves admitted. The prisoner King, in writing lately to his sister, after describing an interview which he had just had with the Acting Minister and Consul, and his unsatisfactory experiences, so far as correspondence with them was concerned, and how the Minister had requested him in future to write to him direct, as the letters were often delayed at the Consulate, wound up thus—

> "So between one and the other, I do not know which to write to; but I think the best thing I can do is never to mind wasting pen and paper on them, but buy tobacco with the money."

He (Dr. Cameron) thought that in connection with the Vote before the House, they would do well to take a leaf out of the book of King's philosophy, and think twice before they expended this £2,000 in maintaining a diplomatic establishment apparently of such very questionable value. He would move the reduction of the Vote.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£163,163," and insert "£161,163,"—(*Dr. Cameron*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That £163,163 stand part of the said Resolution."

Mr. BOURKE said, that he had no inclination to dispute a great deal that had been said by the hon. Member for Glasgow; but the hon. Member seemed to forget that the Government were at that moment pressing very seriously their claims on the subject upon the Peruvian Government, and were doing their best, and fully expected to obtain the release of the two prisoners. They had done so, he believed, in language that was stronger than had ever before been used by one friendly Government to another; and therefore all that the hon. Member had said as to keeping these men in prison, he (Mr. Bourke) was not inclined to dispute. On the contrary, it was a part of the case that the Government were at that moment presenting to the Peruvian Government. He, however, could not help thinking that the hon. Member was doing the cause, which he had at heart, very great injury, and putting these men in much more peril than they were before he took the course which he had pursued. The first thing Her Majesty's Govern-ent were prepared to do was to get ese men out of prison, and to obtain eir release, and therefore he was not ping to say one word on that occasion to any question with regard to comnsation, and what claim Her Ma-sty's Government might or might not ave to make against the Peruvian Gornment hereafter; because what they ok their stand upon was this—that hether these persons were guilty or t, they had been kept such a long me in prison that the Government ad now a right to ask for their release; d further that bringing them to trial ad been protracted under so many prences that it was impossible that they uld concur in it. Under these cirumstances, he did not know whether e hon. Member for Glasgow had any rious intention to press his Motion to division; but if that was his intention hen he (Mr. Bourke) must go into the hole question, for it was obviously a Motion that the Government could not ossibly accept.

Dr. CAMERON said, that under the rcumstances he would not press his Motion.

Mr. BOURKE said, in that case it ould be only necessary for him to deain the House a very few minutes, and e would say only this—Representing s he did the Foreign Office, it was his uty to defend those members of the iplomatic service who might be unfairly ttacked. Now, the charge brought gainst Mr. St. John, which would now e promulgated in all the newspapers, nd go all over the world, was one which eriously affected his professional chaacter. He was satisfied that it would e unfair to Mr. St. John that the lightest slur should rest upon him for nything that had occurred. The early art of the transaction had nothing in he world to do with Mr. St. John, for e was many hundred miles away when t occurred, and he (Mr. Bourke) was fully repared to say that Mr. St. John was a most valuable and indefatigable public ervant, and the Government were perectly satisfied with what had taken lace so far as Mr. St. John was conerned. He had done very good service o his country. Some months ago he aught fever, and they all knew what Peruvian fever was; but he remained gainst the opinion of all his medical dvisers in Peru, and said that he would not leave the country until these men were out of prison, and ultimately it was only upon the strongest advice and upon the statement that it would be nothing less than committing suicide for him longer to remain that he left Peru a few weeks ago. It was due to Mr. St. John, after the aspersions upon his character, to say these few words. He (Mr. Bourke) believed that he had done his duty most thoroughly. As to the claim which Her Majesty's Government had against the Peruvian Government, further Papers would be laid on the Table in the course of a few days. Not very long ago, he read to the House a strong extract from a message which had been sent to Peru. Another dispatch of even more stringent character had been written, and he did not think it was possible to address a friendly Government in stronger terms.

Mr. ANDERSON said, he should like to know what was the strong language that had been used? The remonstrances of the Government had been productive of very little result hitherto, and all he knew was that his unfortunate fellow-subjects had been in prison for a most unreasonable length of time. All Mr. St. John had been able to do had not yet been sufficient to secure the release of the prisoners. He had been powerless to set them free, and he (Mr. Anderson) wished to know what Her Majesty's Government intended to do if the strong words recently used towards Peru were similarly unsuccessful?

Mr. BOURKE would not anticipate what the result of the last despatch would be. All he would say was what was the opinion of the persons who were best informed upon the subject. Within the last few days a new President had been elected in Peru; and, the persons to whom he (Mr. Bourke) had referred were of opinion that this new President was likely to take a more energetic course than that followed by his Predecessor, and that in all probability the case would be satisfactorily settled. The last President was a person who strongly objected to anything like foreign intervention, and was inclined to resent it; whereas, he was told that his Successor was a person who was inclined to attend to a friendly representation made to the Peruvian Government. While the Government had hitherto done their best, at the same time he wished the House to understand that the Government had not taken steps against the Government of Peru which they would not have taken under the same circumstances in the case of a stronger Power. That was one of the principles upon which they acted, and they were doubly cautious when the Power they had to deal with was a weak instead of a strong one. As to what ulterior measures might be taken that was not a question for diplomacy. Diplomacy was carried on up to a certain extent, and then it could go no further, and what might be the ulterior result it was not for him to say.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he had read the Papers very carefully, and he must say that he had come to the conclusion that the conduct of our Minister at Peru, long after the case occurred, was anything but energetic. He did not blame the present Government, because the period to which he referred was before the Government knew anything about the case; but he could not help thinking that if the vessel had been an American vessel, and our Minister an American Minister, with their mode of dealing with such questions, our sailors would have been liberated from prison long ago. Under these circumstances, he did think that our Minister had been very much indeed to blame, and that the Motion made by his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) was a very fitting one.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Subsequent Nine Resolutions *agreed to.*

The Eighteenth Resolution read a second time.

THE DUKE OF SCHOMBERG'S PENSION—COMMUTATION.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. J. COWEN said, before the Resolution was passed, he desired to make a few observations. To put himself in Order he begged to move that the amount be not allowed. He did that, not because he disapproved of the course the Government had adopted in commuting this Pension. On the contrary, he approved of the arrangement by which the annual payment was to be commuted by the payment of a lump sum. It was undesirable, however, for the subject to pass out of consideration without some remark. Hon. Members might not be aware of the circumstances under which this large pension was granted. The facts were these—The pension was conferred on the family of the Duke of Schomberg in 1690. This nobleman was one of the Dutch followers and favourites who were imported into this country by the Prince of Orange. He was made Commander of the Army, and sent to Ireland to suppress the rising of the partizans of King James. He was general of the English Forces that fought the famous battle of the Boyne, and when directing his troops, was killed by an accidental shot from one of his own soldiers. His patron, King William, conferred upon his family a pension of £4,000 a-year. This was paid them for some time, but in 1702 the amount was reduced from £4,000 to £2,600 a-year, which was settled on his family for ever. The grant had been partly commuted since that time, and now the sum paid was, he believed, something like £1,100 per annum. The present holder of the pension had received it for 20 years, and had got from the Exchequer of this country no less a sum than £42,000. Indeed, the full amount that had been paid to the heirs of the Duke of Schomberg since the battle of the Boyne had been little short of half-a-million of money. He did not wish to comment adversely either on the military or personal character of the Duke. No doubt he was an able soldier, and as far as he (Mr. Cowen) knew, a worthy man. But one or two facts should be recollected. At the time he was killed he was 82 years of age. He was not an English general, but a soldier of fortune. He had served in the Dutch, French, Portuguese, and Brandenburg Armies before he came to England. Indeed, he placed his sword and his services at the disposal of any Government in Europe that would pay for them. He was a Marshal of France, a Generalissimo of Prussia, a Grandee of Portugal, and a Duke of England. The heirs of the man who had so many claims upon the consideration of other nations ought not to have entailed upon the heavily-taxed people of this country such a large sum as that he had just mentioned. He did not disprove of the principle of pensioning ccessful military or naval commanders, n who had served their country, her in the field or on the sea, they were titled not only to recompense, but to ndsome recompense. He would treat ch men not only liberally, but generusly. He could conceive instances hen these pensions ought to descend to eir wives and families for the first, and ssibly the second generation; but rely there was neither justice nor fair ay in saddling the revenues of this untry with a payment of £500,000 ring the last 200 years for the services at this Dutch partizan of our Whig ing had rendered. He knew that he uld not carry the House in a division gainst the pension, but it was incum-nt on someone to make this protest efore payment was actually agreed to.

Amendment proposed, "That the said esolution be not agreed to."—(*Mr. oseph Cowen.*)

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he could ot discuss the justice of the payment. ll he could say was, that the amount ey now wished to vote was simply the ommutation of an annual sum that had een paid for nearly two centuries. ome 200 years ago a sum was charged n the Post Office revenues for the heirs f the Duke of Schomberg, and the only ffect of the hon. Member's Motion, if arried, would be that this pension ould continue to be charged on the und. It was a charge effected by Act f Parliament, and could only be reealed by Act of Parliament. He hardly hought Parliament would repeal an ct which gave certain persons an actual roperty in an income amounting to 1,080 a-year. It would be an act of onfiscation, and a precedent which he elieved the hon. Gentleman himself would be slow to set. The question for he House to consider was whether they hould pay a round sum and be done with the pension, or they would keep on aying the annuity as heretofere.

Dr. LUSH quite approved of the ourse the hon. Member for Newcastle had taken in calling the attention of the House to the payment. He thought it a most objectionable one, and the practice of granting hereditary pensions ought to be discontinued. He understood that his hon. Friend's object in calling attention to the matter was more to protest against such grants in the future than as an attempt to evade any responsibility the nation was now under.

Lord ELCHO was of opinion that the proposition of the hon. Member for Newcastle would amount not only to confiscation, but to repudiation.

Mr. J. COWEN, in reply, said, he would not put the House to the trouble of dividing. As he had had an opportunity of calling attention to the subject he would withdraw his Resolution, and the payment, which they could not evade, would have to be agreed to.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Resolution *agreed to.*

Remaining Resolutions *agreed to.*

WAYS AND MEANS—REPORT.

Resolution [August 5] *reported.*

Lord ELCHO wished to know why no sum had been taken in the Estimates, as had been proposed some time since, for the erection of a new War Office, the present building being wholly unfit for habitation? He hoped that next year some steps would be taken either to improve the old office, or to erect a new one. It by no means followed that a new building would necessarily be a healthy one, for he understood that there were three inches of sewage flowing in the basement of the new Foreign and India Offices.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE took that opportunity of asking some explanation with reference to the Vote of £40,000 in aid of the revenues of Fiji, and said, that last year the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies stated it had been proposed to advance £100,000 to the colony; but when the Papers came in he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) could only find that they had voted £40,000. It seemed that the noble Earl, the Colonial Secretary, had engaged to make a distinct advance of £100,000, rather than grant a loan of the same amount, but he promised only £40,000 for last year and the balance £60,000, this year. What he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) complained of was, that when the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies moved the Vote of £40,000 last year, he did not say a word about the further Vote of £60,000 which was to be asked for this year. No doubt the omission was unintentional; but it was one that should not have occurred. In conclusion, he wished to say that he had read with regret the refusal of the colony of New South Wales to contribute to the expense of the Fiji colony after the promise of the previous Governor that it should bear one-half.

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply to the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho), said, that arrangements would be made to place the War Office in a perfect sanitary condition. The erection of a new office was a matter of such importance as to require the most serious consideration of the Government, and the noble Lord had given sufficient reasons to justify their hesitation in embarking on so great an enterprize, for it did not appear to be a matter of certainty that a new building would be superior to an old one in matters of sanitary arrangement. With respect to the observations of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, it appeared from *Hansard* that his hon. Friend the Under Secretary for the Colonies made no reference to the Vote of £60,000 for Fiji this year, when moving a Vote of £40,000 for it last year. The original proposal was made to guarantee a loan of £100,000; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer thought it would be better to come to Parliament for the sum that might be necessary, and he hoped that so large a sum as £100,000 would not be required. That was the limit of liability, and he had good reason to hope that the revenues of the colony would afterwards be sufficient to meet its requirements, and ultimately the money advanced would be repaid.

Resolution *agreed to.*

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL.

[*Lords.*] [Bill 111.]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 7th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 6 (Appointment of Lords of Appeal in Ordinary by Her Majesty).

Mr. Serjeant SIMON moved, as an Amendment, in page 2, line 33, to omit all the words after "shall" down to "longer" in the following line, the effect of the Amendment being that a Lord of Appeal should still be summoned and sit and vote in the House of Lords after he had ceased to be a Lord of Appeal. The hon. and learned Member said, he had an insurmountable objection to the sort of Peerages that were to be created by the Bill, contending that they were inconsistent with the dignity of the Peerage. There would be Peerages for life, Peerages during pleasure, and Peerages during good behaviour. He thought it would be unwise to introduce this novel kind of Peerage. There was nothing analogous to them. They were not like the Scotch and Irish Peerages. These were represented in the House of Lords, and there was no analogy between them and the Bishops who were Lords of Parliament, not Peers, and sat as one of the three Estates of the Realm, representing the Church which was always represented by her Prelates, notwithstanding the death or retirement of any one of them. But these new Lords of Parliament, as some called them, or Peers as they were spoken of elsewhere by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Selborne, and Lord Hatherley, represented nothing, and in the event of their ceasing to be Lords of Appeal would be themselves unrepresented, for being Lords of Parliament, it would be, he took it, unconstitutional for them to vote at the election of Members of the House of Commons. In this aspect, they would be worse off than a retired Bishop, he ceased thereby to be a Lord of Parliament, and might comfort himself on his retirement with the electoral franchise. In fact, these new Peers or Lords of Parliament would form a new caste, and might be called the outcasts of the State. No man of first-rate ability or position at the Bar, such as they had been accustomed to see holding the Great Seal or otherwise raised to the Peerage, would be tempted to accept these new places. Men of this stamp, of those who had hitherto been the Law Lords, would refuse to fill the secondary rank in the Peerage proposed by this clause, and to act the part of Puisne Judges in the House of Lords. These appointments, he thought, would lower the judicial character of the House of Lords, and would lead to political subserviency on the part of those who held them. The weak man would cling to office in order that he might retain his dignity as a sitting Member of the House

Lords, or he might court Government vour by political subserviency in order at he might be made a hereditary eer; while the man of high spirit and dependence, whose talents might be ade available to the country, even ough he had ceased to be a Lord of ppeal, would be relegated to private fe and obscurity, because he had failed court or to conciliate Party favour. n all these grounds, and on many thers which the lateness of the hour revented him going into, he had the ost decided objection to the clause as stood in the Bill, and he hoped that e Committee would agree to his Amend-ent.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 33, after the word "shall," to ave out the words "during the time that he ntinues in his office as a Lord of Appeal in rdinary and no longer." — (*Mr. Serjeant mon.*)

Question proposed, "That the words roposed to be left out stand part of the lause."

Sir GEORGE BOWYER expressed a ope that the Government would not llow the clause to be altered, as it was n strict accordance with the ancient onstitution of the country, the House f Lords having enjoyed its judicial haracter long anterior to the time when ; became a legislative Body. His hon. nd learned Friend the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) argued hat these Judges were to be made Peers, but the fact was they would only be Lords of Parliament; they would only ave to aid the House of Lords in de-ermining appeals. It was true they vere to sit and vote, but they would not be Peers; their position would resemble that of the Bishops, who also were Lords of Parliament, not Peers. The here-ditary character of the House of Lords vas the real essence of the Peerage, and vhere there was not a hereditary right here was no Peerage. To show that he Bishops were not Peers, he would ust state that if a Bishop were charged vith felony, he would not, as a Peer vould be under similar circumstances, be tried by the Court of the High Steward n the House of Lords, but by an ordi-nary jury, like any other commoner. These would not be "Peers made by statute," for the Act would simply empower the Queen to make a Lord of Parliament, and if he resigned his office he would, like a Bishop who resigned, be no longer a Member of the House of Lords, and would no longer be summoned to sit there. There were Constitutional objections to the creation of life Peerages, as it would tend to degrade the House of Lords to the level of those miserable Senates which existed in Continental countries, and this was probably the reason why the Bill did not propose to make life Peers.

Mr. GREGORY supported the Amendment. He thought it would be a degradation of men of high legal training, having made them Barons with the right of taking part in all the discussions in the House of Lords, whether judicial or legislative, to turn round upon them when they had given their best services to the country, and tell them they should no longer enjoy those privileges. There would, he believed, be a difficulty in finding men to take the office under such conditions. It would, too, when men had grown old, prevent them from resigning, and thus they might have a number of effete Judges exercising the function of Judges of Appeal.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, that the House of Lords had already determined that there should be no judicial Peers for life, and appealed to the House whether, in these circumstances, it was worth while to discuss the question. Hitherto the elevation of a man to a Judgeship placed him beyond political partizanship; but this Bill placed four Judges in a political arena, and the Amendment would give the Government an unlimited power of increasing the number of political partizans in the other House by appointing Judges who might resign soon after their appointment. As to the statement that the condition attached to the acceptance of these high offices would be considered by eminent men as an insult, he would ask whether a clergyman considered it an insult to be asked to become a Bishop upon a precisely similar footing with regard to the House of Lords. He hoped the Government would not accept the Amendment.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS maintained that the decision of the House of Lords against Peerages for life ought not to be any difficulty in the way of the House of Commons doing what was right in the matter. In the passage of the Bill through their Lordships' House Lord

Cairns, Lord Selborne, and Lord Hatherley had never treated these Lords of Appeal as other Peers. He (Mr. Torrens) had found by reference to the records that 20 years ago a Bill was sent down from the House of Lords proposing to create Peers for life, and Lord Palmerston moved its second reading in the House of Commons. The Bill was opposed by Mr. Gladstone, Lord Russell, and Sir James Graham, because one of its clauses provided that Lords of Appeal in ordinary should be chosen from the Judges, without being Peers, as well as Peers for life. Independent Members were induced to oppose the Bill, and it was lost because it was not solely for the creation of Peerages for life. The House of Lords had taken back their jurisdiction, and it was for Parliament to see that that jurisdiction was a reality. He would remind the House that this was not the first time the House of Commons had had the power of revising the indiscretion of the House of Lords in regard to its own constitution. There was a strong feeling in favour of modifying the present clause, and he hoped the Government would not be deterred from undertaking the task by any false delicacy towards the House of Lords.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he felt satisfaction in approaching the discussion of that Amendment, because he felt that after they had dealt with it they would get on rapidly with the Bill. The matter raised by the Amendment, no doubt, was important, but the question was not whether they should create life Peerages or not, but simply whether the eminent persons who were to be created Lords of Appeal, Assistants in Administering the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords, were, after they ceased to be Lords of Appeal, to sit in that House and vote or not. The question was one of interest to those who might be created Lords of Appeal; and it was of serious importance to the House of Lords, because it might trench on the constitution of that House. Far be it from him to contend that the House of Commons should succumb to, or become subservient to, the other House of Parliament; but in dealing with the question they should bear in mind they were dealing with the privileges and the constitution of the House of Lords. If they rejected the Amendment, they should be doing no injustice to the eminent persons who were to be appointed, because they would accept the appointment with the full knowledge that they would cease to have the right of sitting and voting in the House of Lords when they ceased to hold office. On the other hand, if the Amendment were accepted, a more tempting bait would be offered, and they would secure a more perfect and complete tribunal. But then they would be trenching on the privileges of the House of Lords, for there could be no doubt that the House of Lords entertained a strong repugnance to the creation of life Peerages, and if they passed the Amendment they would compel that House to accept life Peers against their own wish and desire. In 1856 and in 1869 the question of life Peerages was discussed in the House of Lords, and if the conclusion arrived at was not that life Peerages were illegal, it certainly was that they were undesirable and inexpedient. No doubt, if Parliament chose to clothe Her Majesty with the authority to do so, she could institute life Peerages; but the sole question for them was whether it was expedient that that should be done. The hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) said that when these Assistant Lords of Appeal ceased to hold office they would occupy an anomalous position; but no doubt they would retain their office as long as they were capable of discharging the duties of their office. It would be very dangerous to place in the hands of a Prime Minister the power of creating at any particular juncture of politics a number of life Peers under the disguise of appointing Assistant Lords of Appeal. What the Government wanted to do was to strengthen the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords by providing them with able and dignified Assistants who would be well paid for their services; and also to strengthen and improve the Intermediate Court of Appeal. If the hon. and learned Member's Amendment were adopted, the House of Lords would be certain to reject it, and the result would be that a great and beneficial measure would be lost, at all events, for the present Session.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, his objection was a purely practical one. He believed that if they adopted the pro-al of the Government they would be able to obtain men of the highest lity, such as had held the Great Seal, these offices, and they would fail to prove the Appellate Jurisdiction of the use of Lords. He should therefore ss his Amendment to a division.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 107; es 30: Majority 77.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT, in moving an Amendment, in page 2, line 36, er "heirs," to add—

> "Provided always, That when under the pro- ions of this Act, or at any time hereafter, Judge of the High Court of Justice shall, ile he is such Judge, be appointed a Lord of peal in Ordinary, he shall not receive a less ary than he was entitled to receive while dge of the High Court of Justice,"

ged that in constituting a Supreme urt of Appeal it was most desirable at the highest judicial talent and the ost matured judicial learning and ex- rience should be imported into it. ue it was that at the present time the ouse of Lords was exceedingly rich in gal ability, as they had there not only e Lord Chancellor, but other legal nctionaries no longer in office, among hom might be recorded the very emi- nt names of Lord Selborne, Lord atherley, Lord Penzance, and Lord 'Hagan. Those distinguished men ere admissible into the proposed Court ' Appeal under the 2nd section of the ill; but the time might come when e House of Lords would not be so fted with judicial ability and autho- ty, and in such a case it would be very sirable that the doors of the new Court hould be open to the Chief Justices and ord Chief Baron, whose presence would reatly enhance its dignity and weight. was for that reason he (Sir Eardley Vilmot) proposed his present Amend- ent. With the salary of £6,000, as present proposed, it could not be ex- ected that the Chiefs would accept ppointments, their acceptance of which ould entail upon them a loss of salary, ithout corresponding other advantages. he question of the Judicial Peerage ad already been discussed under the mendment of his hon. and learned riend the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. erjeant Simon), and he should be out f Order in again adverting to it then. But his Amendment as to salaries had been objected to as offering promotion to Judges. He would remind the Committee of several eminent names, where Judges holding highly honourable but inferior posts, had been transferred to more exalted offices, with great advantage to the country, and without the slightest impeachment or sacrifice of their moral independence. Campbell, Cranworth, Truro, Hatherley, were all Judges before they became Lords Chancellors, and no one found fault with their elevation because they had previously sat on the Judicial Bench. Say what men might, the hope of promotion in every station of life, the highest as well as the lowest, was a most powerful stimulus and incentive to increased exertion in the path of duty. Under the present provisions of the Bill, the two new Lords of Appeal would actually take social precedence of the Lord Chief Justice of England, and would continue to do so, in every case where he did not happen to be a Peer of the Realm. Even their eldest sons, as the Committee were at present advised, would take precedence of the Lord Chief Justices and Lord Chief Baron, if Commoners. Influenced by these reasons, he appealed to the First Lord of the Treasury, who was then present and had introduced the Bill, to accept his Amendment. The Puisne Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature were eligible under the 2nd section after two years' holding of the judicial office, and the principle of promotion was directly sanctioned and recognized in their case, and why should a hard-and-fast rule be laid down directly opposite in principle, by which they would lose the advantage and opportunity of inviting such men as Sir Alexander Cockburn and Sir FitzRoy Kelly, to add strength and lustre to the highest legal tribunal in the Kingdom?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL opposed the Amendment, because he thought it would be undesirable to take away either of the Chief Justices or Chief Baron from the High Court of Justice, and because he thought it would be unwise to make such a difference of salary as that proposed.

Amendment *negatived*.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE (for Mr. HEYGATE) moved, as an Amendment, in page 3, line 4, after "Privy Council," to add—

> "Nothing in the Order of Council of the twentieth day of February, one thousand six hundred and twenty-seven, or in any other Order in Council, rule, or practice of the Privy Council, or of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, shall, for the future, be construed to prevent any member or members of the said Judicial Committee, when sitting at the hearing of any appeal or petition, from delivering his or their separate opinion or judgment as to the report which should be made to Her Majesty upon the said appeal or petition."

In the unfortunate absence of his hon. Friend the Member for Leicestershire (Mr. Heygate) it had devolved upon him to move an Amendment, in which, however, he thoroughly agreed, providing that the Members of the Judicial Committee should deliver their judgments separately, instead of, as at present, settling a report in private, in which of course the majority prevailed, however narrow it might be. He assumed that the general object of the Acts for the reform of the judicial system, of which the present Bill was the concluding one, was to produce uniformity of procedure, if so, his Amendment came with the strongest recommendation, for the Judicial Committee was peculiar and unique in its present practice. This had nothing to recommend it in itself, for it was the sole creation of certain Orders of February 20, 1627. It was, in fact, the survival of the procedure of that byeword for tyranny—the Star Chamber, a fact not likely to recommend it now for continuance. These Orders laid down, among other matters, that—

> "The Lords are, by questions or otherwise, to inform themselves of the truth of the matter of fact, but not to discover any opinions till all be fully heard;"

and he put it to the Committee, if the Judicial Committee did not, in its several members contravene this order every time it sat. The practical result of this way of deciding, by a report in which the minority had to bend to the majority, was that the real minds of the jurists making up the Court was never reached. He appealed to the Committee, if the great value of a Court of Appeal, as of a Court sitting *in Banco*, was not this very circumstance of the various lights thrown upon a question by the acute but dissimilar adjudicating intellects. This in the Judicial Committee was replaced by a washed out compromise, an essay from which the spirit had evaporated, but which, from the form in which it was cast, had the false air of a sort of edict or institute of law when it was, after all, only a body of reasons for the real judgment which ambuscaded behind it. He begged to move the Amendment.

MR. FARLEY LEITH believed that the present mode of delivering judgment was one of the best characteristics of the Court, which, it should be remembered, was one of Final Appeal. It mattered not therefore whether one Judge was dissentient or not, where there were four sitting, and could be of no avail to the suitor. He thought it undesirable that the Judges should give their opinions *seriatim,* as it was better that the Court should appear to be unanimous in giving a decision. He therefore opposed the Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that, properly speaking, no judgment at all was given in the Privy Council, but advice was given to Her Majesty. Besides, the procedure of the Privy Council was not a matter that was germane to the Bill. If any alteration were needed, it had better be made by means of an Order in Council.

MR. BUTT thought that the first was a reason against any judgment at all being given, but he admitted that the Amendment was not germane to the subject of the Bill.

MR. GREGORY said, his experience was that the judgments given in the Privy Council were most satisfactory; and he feared that if individual judgments were given on Indian appeals the Natives would not be satisfied whenever any difference of opinion amongst the Judges was apparent.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. WATKIN WILLIAMS proposed to amend the clause by inserting a Proviso—

> "That the appointment of Lords of Appeal in Ordinary under the provisions of this Act shall in no way affect or alter the duty of such Peers of Parliament as have held any of the high judicial offices aforesaid to attend at the hearing and determination of appeals in the House of Lords."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL opposed the Amendment, which he described as a statutory scarecrow.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Supplemental Provisions.

Clause 7 (Hearing and determination of appeals during prorogation).

Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS said, that an Amendment would be necessary in order to enable Lords of Appeal who might be appointed after the Prorogation and before the next Sitting of Parliament to be able to take their seats and be sworn in. He therefore proposed after the word "therewith," in page 3, line 25, to insert "and for the purpose of Lords of Appeal taking their seats and the oaths."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL accepted the Amendment.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON saw no necessity for the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Hearing and determination of appeals during dissolution).

Sir GEORGE BOWYER observed that the clause was intended to enable appeals to be heard and determined during the dissolution of Parliament; but the wording of the clause seemed to him to create a new Court, and he thought it would be better for the House of Lords to hear and determine the appeals. He would, therefore, move the substitution of the words "House of Lords" for Lords of Appeal.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he would consider the matter before the Report was taken; but it was his opinion that the wording of the clause was correct.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER explained that he was only anxious that the House of Lords should hear the appeals, and not an entirely new Court.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN remarked that the words "a continuation of the House of Lords" were somewhat strange, and he hoped they would be struck out.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 9 to 12, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Amendment of Acts.

Clause 13 (Amendment of the Act of 34 & 35 Vict. c. 91, relating to the constitution of the Privy Council).

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE (for Mr. Heygate) moved, as an Amendment, in page 5, line 21, to leave out all after "given to Her Majesty." This was another Amendment, of which he had taken charge, for the hon. Member for Leicestershire (Mr. Heygate), and in which also he cordially agreed. It was to omit words in Clause 12, permitting the presence under certain regulations, to be hereafter named of Episcopal assessors at the sittings of the Judicial Committee when engaged upon ecclesiastical appeals. In moving this Amendment, he was only calling upon the Committee to confirm what the House had already concluded with a more complete and vehement unanimity than he had ever seen it employ on any question. The words which he called upon them to omit were in form to relieve the Ecclesiastical Court of Appeal from Episcopal assessors. It was, in substance, to declare that, being a Court of Law to define the legal meaning of certain documents, it ought to be composed of lawyers whose business it was to interpret such documents, and not partly of lawyers and partly of theologians, whose knowledge, coloured as it must be by conscientious convictions, was of course, of a partizan character. The name and pretence of their being only "assessors" would deceive no one. They were meant to be Judges, and only more influential Judges because not having countable votes they would exercise illicit influence. They would be to the real Court what a masterful wife was to her husband. But why did he appeal to the former unanimity of the House? When the original Bill for the reform of our Judicature was before Parliament in 1873, it came down to this House with provisions for a Supreme Court of Appeal from which ecclesiastical causes were excluded, for fear of overloading it as the then Lord Chancellor (Lord Selborne) owned. For these appeals, then, the Judicial Committee was retained. However, his right hon. Friend the present Secretary of State for War moved the omission of this restriction—and why?—simply and solely because the Judicial Committee was a Court of a mixed legal and ecclesiastical composition. The debate took place on July 4, 1873; and among the arguments of the Secretary for War was found the remarkable statement that—

> "The Judicial Committee gave an impression that it was rather a Court of Heresy than a Court of Law, where there were ecclesiastical persons sitting upon the tribunal, and that cases were decided rather by a theological bias than by a strict interpretation of the documents before it."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxvi. 1788.]

He also took the opportunity of pointing out that the Lower House of Convocation had expressed the desire that the Court of Final Appeal should deal with ecclesiastical questions. His right hon. Friend was followed by the hon. and learned Member for the City of Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), who very strongly supported the same view. So did that very acute lawyer, Dr. Ball, now Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and the hon. and learned Member for Denbighshire (Mr. Osborne Morgan). The hon. and learned Member for South-west Lancashire, now Home Secretary, followed, and he said it was—

> "The birthright of every layman in this country, that the doctrines of the Church were laid down in certain documents which were binding upon the clergy, and the clergy were entitled to have these documents construed according to the strict rules of law."—[*Ibid.*, 1791.]

His own right hon. Colleague (Mr. Walpole), still speaking in the same sense, laid down that—

> "It was a matter of very great importance in reference to the welfare of the country, and of the Church itself—first, that the tribunal to decide on Appeal should be simply a judicial tribunal, and secondly, that the people of the country should know and feel that it was so."—[*Ibid.*, 1792.]

He passed over his own remarks, and need only point out that the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Cawley) also approved of the Motion. Finally, the then Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone), in assenting to the Motion, and after remarking on the extraordinary unanimity with which it had been received, observed—

> "He thought that they should commit a great error if they were to attempt to secure even a shadow of religious conformity on the part of the Members of the Court, or to attempt anything in the nature of a test which would throw upon those Judges a character other than that of Judges."—[*Ibid.*, 1795.]

There was, of course, no division upon a Motion thus supported. When the Bill went back to "another place" that Assembly, on July 24, in accepting the excision of the Judicial Committee, and, therefore, the abolition of Bishop-Judges, hampered the Court of Appeal with Assessor Bishops. He need not dwell on the influences which had brought this about. It was too late in the Session to risk a conflict between the two Houses. But it was generally felt in this House that the Bill had been returned by them to the Lords in a much better shape than that in which it had for the second time come down for the consideration of the Commons. The House of Commons had, without distinction of Party, and by the voices of Leaders on both sides, emphatically declared against the principle of clerical Judges sitting upon appeals affecting matters which were really questions of law, and they had—though not quite completely—succeeded in stamping their conclusions on the Act of 1873. He now called upon the Committee to respect those conclusions, and by rejecting the words of which he moved the omission, to take care that the obnoxious principle did not again make for itself a clandestine lodgment within our judicial system.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 21, to leave out from the word "Majesty," to the end of the Clause."—(*Mr. Beresford Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL opposed the Amendment. He said that the Archbishops and Bishops were part of the Judicial Committee, they were among the Judges, and what was proposed was to repeal that provision of the Clergy Discipline Act and substitute for it another which would give power to the Queen in Council to appoint the Archbishops and Bishops assessors. Even if it were approved of by the Commons, it would be certainly rescinded by the Lords.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD said, it was most important that the decisions should be purely legal, and therefore he was strongly of opinion that there should be no Episcopal assessors.

Mr. MARTEN said, that the clause with regard to assessors was not germane to the main purpose of the Bill.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 45; Noes 45.

And, the numbers being equal, the Chairman stated that, as the House would have another opportunity of considering the Question before the Committee, upon the Report of the Bill, he accordingly declared himself with the Ayes.

On Question, "That the clause be *agreed to?*

Mr. CHARLEY moved its omission on account of a doubt as to its probable effect in the colonies.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER supported the Amendment as likely to remove a difficulty in the case.

Mr. FARLEY LEITH considered the matter might be safely left in the hands of the Privy Council as at present constituted.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, there must be some statutory provision on the question, because if there were not, when one of the Judges died, no appointment of a successor could be made. By an Amendment which he had placed on the Paper power was provided to appoint an assessor in the case of the death or resignation of a Judge.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, the assessor was the man who understood the Mahomedan law, and the Judges were ignorant of it. The assessor should therefore turn the Judges out.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 14 *struck out.*

Clauses 15 to 17, inclusive, *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

COMMONS BILL.

CONSIDERATION OF LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Amendments, as far as the Amendment in page 22, line 33, read a second time, and *agreed to.*

Page 22, line 33, after the word "situate," to insert the words

> "but the provisions of this section shall not apply to any commons or waste lands whereon the rights of common are vested solely in the lord of the manor,"

the next Amendment, read a second time.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE took objection to the Amendment, contending that all protection against illegal inclosure would by it be taken away and the Bill reduced to a nullity. He would move that the House disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment.

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 47; Noes 18: Majority 29.

Subsequent Amendments *agreed to.*

MUNICIPAL PRIVILEGES (IRELAND) BILL.—[Bill 39.]

(*Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Butt, Mr. Ronayne.*)

CONSIDERATION. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [5th August] proposed (on Consideration of the Bill, as amended), page 3, line 42, after the word "privilege," to insert the words "or to be selected to any corporate office."

Mr. M. BROOKS said, he had assented to the addition of certain words. He hoped it might now be read a third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: By the general assent of the House, at this period of the Session, it is not unusual for the House to take more than one stage of a Bill at a sitting. ["Hear, hear!"]

Debate *resumed.*

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Another Amendment made.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

STANDING ORDERS REVISION.

Select Committee to revise the Standing Orders:—Mr. Stephen Cave, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Hankey, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Monk, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Anderson, Viscount Galway, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Colonel North, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Sir Henry Wolff, Mr. Bristowe, and Mr. Raikes:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the Quorum.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Raikes, Bill to apply a sum, out of the Consolidated Fund, to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. William Henry Smith.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time.

WINTER ASSIZES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Bill to provide for the holding of Winter Assizes in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Colman O'Loghlen and Mr. Stacpoole.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 290.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 8*th August*, 1876.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Registration of Births and Deaths (Ireland) Amendment * (208); Forfeiture Relief * (210); Municipal Privileges (Ireland) * (211); Police (Expenses) Act Continuance * (212); Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment (Dublin) * (213).

Second Reading—Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) * (190); Tralee Savings Bank * (202); Elementary Education (204); Pollution of Rivers (207).

Committee—Exhausted Parish Lands * (186).

Committee—Report—Cattle Disease (Ireland) * (195); Savings Banks (Barrister) * (198); Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates) * (199); Bishopric of Truro * (201).

Report—Erne Lough and River * (189); Ardglass Harbour * (193); Juries Procedure (Ireland) * (196).

Third Reading—Poor Law Rating (Ireland) * (197), and *passed*.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

(*The Lord President.*)

(NO. 204.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said: My Lords, of the various measures which it has been my fortune to offer for your Lordships' consideration during this and previous Sessions of Parliament, I doubt whether there is any of more importance than the one which I shall now ask your Lordships to read a second time, dealing as it does with Elementary Education throughout the country, and thus affecting the welfare not only of large portions of the humbler classes, but also all who take an interest in the welfare of society at large. Up to 1870, as your Lordships are perfectly aware, the education of the country was conducted mainly, if not altogether, by voluntary efforts. Latterly supplemental grants were made by the Government; but up to 1870 no legislation respecting elementary education found a place in the Statute Book. In 1870 the Government of the day for the first time undertook the task of legislating with a view to educate the children of this country; not, indeed, by overthrowing and supplanting the voluntary system which had worked so well up to that date, but by supplementing it, and by providing for deficiencies which the beneficent efforts of those who had upheld the voluntary system had been unable altogether to overtake. As I wish to impress upon your Lordships the views entertained by the framers of that Act, and the object which they avowed in legislating in this matter, I think I cannot do better than read a few sentences uttered by the Prime Minister of that day; and I wish to do this the more because part of my case will be that in this measure we are in no way departing from the principles then laid down by the Government. On the third reading of the Elementary Education Act, in 1870, Mr. Gladstone said—

> "We have had to steer our course amid competing bodies and conflicting difficulties. It was with us an absolute necessity—a necessity of honour and a necessity of policy—to respect and to favour the educational establishments and machinery we found existing in the country. It was impossible for us to join in the language or to adopt the tone which was conscientiously and consistently taken by some Members of the House, who look upon these voluntary schools, having generally a denominational character, as admirable passing expedients, fit, indeed, to be tolerated for a time, deserving all credit on account of the motives which led to their foundation, but wholly unsatisfactory as to their main purpose, and, therefore, to be supplanted by something they think better. That is a perfectly fair and intelligible theory for any Gentleman to entertain, but I am quite sure it will be felt that it has never been the theory of the Government."

And later on the same right hon. Gentleman added—

> "So in this matter of education it is a great mistake and error in our view to think that

secular education given by a State machinery is, *per se*, better and more valuable than the same education given by machinery voluntary in its character. Setting aside that which is abstractedly desirable, I think we are justified in feeling that this enormous power which exists in the country ought to be turned to account." —[3 *Hansard*, cciii. 746-7.]

I merely quote these remarks to show the principles then enunciated by the Government, more particularly because, as I said, it is upon those lines we believe the present measure to be founded. The provisions of the Act of 1870 are so well known that it will be unnecessary for me to enter into minute details of that measure—especially as I am not here to find fault with its provisions. On the contrary, considering the novel character of the legislation initiated by that measure; considering the comparatively short period which has elapsed since that Act passed, I think that the Government which proposed this legislation, and your Lordships who assisted in passing it, may very well be satisfied with the results it has attained. I believe the Act of 1870 has worked a great amount of good throughout the country, and therefore I am contented to offer my meed of praise to those who were its authors. A few figures will show the progress made since 1870. It is necessary I should quote them, because they form the foundation of the case upon which I shall ask your Lordships to pass the present Bill. In 1870 the schools inspected by Her Majesty's Inspectors were 8,281 : in 1875 the number inspected was 13,217. The scholars in average attendance in 1870 were 1,152,389: in 1875 the scholars in average attendance were 1,837,180 :—showing a gradual increase in the attendance during each year from 1870 to 1875. The scholars on the school register in 1870 were 1,693,059: in 1875 they numbered 2,744,300. It was impossible to imagine that the Act of 1870, dealing as it did with so vast a number of the population of this country, would not sooner or later require some alteration; and since I have been in the office which I have now the honour to hold, it has been my duty to watch very closely the working of the Act with a view to see whether any, and, if any, what improvements should be made in its provisions. In 1870, or shortly afterwards, the Education Department appointed Inspectors who were to go through the country and ascertain the educational requirements of the country. After due inquiry, very carefully made by these Inspectors in all parts of the country, the following facts came to the knowledge of the Department. It was proved to the satisfaction of the Department that there were 3,250,000 children who ought to have been at school at that time, while the actual number of scholars attending day and night schools was only 1,225,764. At that time the accommodation for children who ought to have been at school was not sufficient, for the Returns show that there was only accommodation for 1,878,584 children; so that if all the children of school age had been in attendance there would have been a deficiency of accommodation for 1,371,416 children. Before the year 1870 no one had any power to compel that deficiency to be made up, nor was there power in any way to compel children to attend school. But by the Act of 1870 the country was divided into school districts, and every district was by the 5th section of the Act compelled to supply sufficient school accommodation for the children in that district; and if the district did not supply the deficiency the Department was empowered to require that a school board should be formed, which would have the power of making bye-laws to compel children to attend school in accordance with the provisions of the Act. Having, therefore, by the operation of the Act of 1870, secured that there should be accommodation for the proper number of children who ought to be at school, it was quite obvious that the next thing was to encourage the attendance of children in the schools. By a Return, which I hold in my hand, I find that in 1870 the accommodation was for something under 2,000,000, and that in 1875 accommodation had been provided for rather more than 3,000,000 children. That Return shows that, while the amount of accommodation provided had been increased very largely between 1870 and 1875, the average attendance of the children had not at all increased in the same ratio. I find that the attendance in 1870 was something over 1,000,000 children, and that in 1875 there was an attendance of about 1,800,000, whereas the figure ought to have been very much nearer 3,000,000. In looking over the figures which have been prepared for the use of the Department and of the public, in order that we may see exactly the educational state and the educational wants of the country, it must be a source of considerable congratulation to all friends of the Established Church in the country to see that, so far from having been paralyzed by being brought into competition with the school boards, the Church has continued to extend her sphere of usefulness, and has apparently been incited with new vigour by the competition for providing for the educational wants of the country. By the increase of her schools and scholars she has imparted to those who are within her pale that blessing which she has for so many generations conferred on large numbers of the people of the country—namely, the blessing of sound secular and also religious education. Well, there being so much more accommodation in schools than children were found to occupy, an effort was made—particularly in the rural districts—to introduce a measure for the purpose of inducing children to attend school. Accordingly, the Agricultural Children Act was passed in 1873, and it was hoped it would give the means of inducing children to attend school, and so make up for the deficiency which has been already shown to exist. That measure passed into law; but it had one very remarkable defect—namely, that there was no authority under that Act to compel its being put into operation. It is true that in some counties the police were authorized to give effect to the Act; but in other counties such a mode of employing the police was much objected to—and I think it will be obvious to your Lordships that the police are not exactly the instruments we should like to make use of as the means for getting children to school. Therefore, as a means for compelling the attendance of children at school, the Agricultural Children Act became practically a dead letter, and we had to consider how we could deal with the whole subject, and whether it was possible to maintain in any shape the provisions of that Act. We found that we could not in any way avail ourselves of its provisions, and therefore the only course left was to repeal that Act and to endeavour to do with other machinery that which the Agricultural Children Act had failed to do. My Lords, in preparing the measure which we now offer to your consideration we wish to retain the great principles which, as I have shown, were in the Act of 1870, and which were the principles that actuated those who brought that measure forward—namely, that the action of the Government ought not to interfere with the local efforts which were being made for the supply of scholars to the schools, but, on the contrary, that we were merely to assist in supplying those deficiencies which had arisen by the measure we bring forward to ensure that there should be for the benefit of every child a sound elementary education. Having provided that there should be accommodation for the children, it was obviously impossible that we could stop there. The providing of these schools had been a considerable tax on those who were called upon to subscribe for their erection, and it was clear that we must provide some means for securing the attendance of the children in the schools. We had two courses open to us. We might deal with these schools by means of what is called direct compulsion, and we also had an opportunity afforded to us of adopting compulsion in an indirect manner. I do not know what the views of the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) may be on this subject. It may be that he will follow me, and that he will insist upon the merits of direct compulsion: but, if he does, I will ask him to consider whether in the abstract direct interference with the daily life of every parent in this country can be considered a good thing, and whether we had not better leave them to do that which is their duty, and which we believe and hope the great bulk of parents in this country will be willing to do. We presume in this Bill—and it is a presumption we have followed throughout—that if we remove the inducement of children under a certain age earning wages a parent will do his duty and his children will go to school. By this Bill we have provided that if a parent shows himself to be unworthy of the confidence reposed in him, and does not send his children to school, the State must step in for the benefit of the State itself and also for the benefit of the children. If he habitually neglects to provide for the education of his children, the State will say to the parent—"It is time that some measure should be taken which shall induce you to take a different course, and to provide that education which is absolutely necessary." My Lords, these are the general views which Her Majesty's Government have entertained in dealing with this subject. I will now venture to point out as briefly as I can some of the principal provisions contained in the present Bill. Clause 4 introduces for the first time a very important—I will not say alteration, but —incident in the legislation on this subject. That clause sets out that it is in future the duty of a parent to provide for the education of his children. The Bill provides that under the age of 10 there shall be an absolute prohibition of the employment of children; and between the ages of 10 and 14 a child can be employed only when it has passed a certain Standard and has put in 250 attendances at not more than two schools every year for five years. This, in short, is a measure which declares that a child must be either at work or at school. The provisions of the Act will not come into full play until the year 1880, and in the interval the lower Standards will be admitted, because it would be obviously unfair that its complete operation should not be suspended for a short time. Next comes a very important portion of the Bill—the authority by which it is to be enforced. As I have said, there is in the case of the Agricultural Children Act no such authority, and it has therefore become a dead letter. Under these circumstances, we have considered which would be the best authority for enforcing the provisions of this Bill, and we thought the best course to pursue would be to avail ourselves of the existing authority. We propose, then, that in a school board district the duty of enforcing the Act should be imposed on the school board, while in other districts it is to be enforced by a committee appointed annually, in boroughs by the Town Council, and in parishes by the Guardians of the Union. The Boards of Guardians are to appoint annually school attendance committees, who are to see that the provisions of the Act are carried out, and they in their turn are to have power to appoint local committees in the various parishes or other areas. These bodies will have the same powers as a school board to enforce attendance; but, in the case of parishes, the power of making compulsory bye-laws would only be exercised on the requisition of a parish. There are, I may add, exceptions to the attendance of children—first of all, where there is no school within two miles; secondly, where the school is closed; and, thirdly, where the local authority may suspend, for the purposes of harvest operations, the provisions of the Act. We require that all children should attend school, and it is perfectly obvious, therefore, that some provision must be made for the case of parents who are not in sufficiently good circumstances to pay the necessary fees. With that view, there is a provision in the Bill enabling Boards of Guardians to pay the amount of the school fees for such parents who may not be paupers, in the strict sense of the word, but who are too poor to pay them. That being so, the 25th clause of the Act of 1870 is proposed to be repealed, at the instance of one of the most eminent promoters of that Act—the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster); and the payment of fees in the case of poor parents is handed over to the Boards of Guardians, who, in my opinion, are the proper authorities to deal with the matter, because they must be far better judges of the condition of the parents than any school board. The practice, I may add, of enabling Boards of Guardians to pay school fees is one which has always prevailed in Scotland, where it has worked well. Some objection has been taken to this proposal on the score that the religious difficulty was involved in it; but I do not think that any such difficulty will be found to arise. Every noble Lord who attends Boards of Guardians will, I am sure, bear me out when I say that when relief is sought by any one applying to those Boards there is no question as to the religious views of the applicant. I find that the Parochial Boards in Scotland pay large sums for education. I find by a Return that they pay annually for public schools, £3,968; for schools connected with the Church of Scotland, £1,072; for Free Church schools, £210; for schools belonging to the Episcopal Church, £50; and for Roman Catholic schools, £352. The rate of expenditure per scholar in average attendance is, I find, £1 18*s.* for public schools, £1 13*s.* for schools connected with the Church of Scotland, £1 11*s.* for the Free Church, £1 9*s.* for the Episcopal Church, and £1 6*s.* for the Roman Catholic. In Scotland, therefore, it cannot be said that the religious difficulty interferes with the payment of fees for poor parents. The 10th clause therefore provides that the Guardians may, if satisfied that the parent of any child, not being a pauper, is unable by reason of poverty to pay the ordinary school fee, pay such school fee, or any part of it, not exceeding 3*d*. a-week —and it is expressly provided that the parent shall not, by reason of this payment, be deprived of any franchise or privilege, or be subjected to any disability or disqualification; nor is such payment to be made or refused on any condition with respect to the school to which the parent may elect to send the child. Where the parent habitually neglects to provide efficient elementary instruction for his child, or the child is found habitually wandering about the streets, the local authority is to warn the parent, and the warning failing, a court of summary jurisdiction may, on complaint of the local authority, order the child to attend some public elementary or other efficient school; and, this order not being complied with, the court may for the first offence inflict a fine of 5*s.*; but if the parent satisfies the court that he has used all due means to enforce compliance with the order, the court may order the child to a certified day or other industrial school. This brings me to the very important part of the Bill relating to industrial schools. This, no doubt, is an experiment, but it is an experiment to meet exceptional cases that do to some extent exist. It proposed that school boards may, with the consent of the Secretary of State for the Home Department—not of the Education Department—establish a certified day industrial school. There are in every large town a number of children of poor but respectable parents who are engaged all day in industrial occupations, and are absent from home; and unless some means are found of dealing with these children they will in all probability receive no education at all, and may become inmates of our gaols. The day industrial school seems the best instrument for this purpose. It is, therefore, provided that the Secretary of State, when satisfied that some such school is necessary or expedient for the proper training and control of that class of children in any district, may certify any industrial school in the neighbourhood, established under the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, to be a certified day industrial school; and the court before whom any such child is brought may order it to be sent to such school. Upon this subject, rather than put forward my own opinion, I will refer to the testimony of others. I will refer to the opinion of the late Dean of Ripon (Dr. Turner), who has as much experience on this question as any man in the country. Dr. Turner believes that most essential and effectual relief will be afforded by the establishment of day industrial schools; and they will have this advantage over the ordinary industrial schools, inasmuch as while children cost 7*s.* per head in the ordinary industrial schools, they will cost 3*s.* per head in the day schools. There is another point to which I wish to call attention, and that is an important alteration in the conditions upon which the Government grants are made. The present system of Parliamentary grants undoubtedly presses very hardly on poor districts, because the principle is that for every amount supplied by the central authority you require a similar amount to be supplied locally. This tells much against poor town districts where there are no rich subscribers, as well as against small country parishes, where the number of scholars are few, and where the cost of teaching 30 scholars is as great as the cost of teaching 50 or 60. This alteration in the provision applies equally to board schools in town and country and to other schools. We have had a Memorial from the London School Board, which represents a great amount of intelligence, energy, and vigour, and which is not surpassed by any other school board in the country. This Memorial, which is signed by a majority of the members, brings under our notice the inadequacy of the Government grant, and they say that compared with the promises held out upon the passing of the Education Bill, the grant is very inadequate. This is a Memorial of very great weight, and I think it ought to have some influence with your Lordships. I shall not read the Memorial at length, but the following words will show its purport:—

> "The increase in the cost of schools has been so much greater than the increase of the grants that the actual burden of maintenance is now

considerably heavier than before the passing of the Education Act in 1870. The consequence is that many schools, of whose efficiency there is no doubt, find it difficult to maintain their footing. The anticipated increase of cost for all schools has been more than realized, but the increase of aid in the way of public grant has fallen far short of what was expected. The average increase of grant since 1870 has, in fact, as your Lordships are aware, been considerably less than one-half of the average increase of expenditure for public elementary schools since the same date. The board would regard it as a public injury of a very serious character if any large proportion of good elementary schools, at present under Government inspection, and bearing their share in the supply of the educational needs of the metropolis, were to be closed or transferred to the board. Either alternative would entail such an increased charge on the rates as the Board could not contemplate without apprehension. The removal of all limitations on the amount of grant which may be earned would create the stimulus necessary to prompt alike managers and teachers to the attainment of the highest excellence."

The system which has been adopted in this country is payment by results; and the logical consequence of payment by results is that you must pay for the result irrespective of the cost at which that result has been obtained. The payment is for the result which the school can show you. If the scholars achieve a certain amount of efficiency, you must pay them a sum of money, and it should be nothing to you what is the sum at the cost of which that efficiency has been attained. If 17*s.* 6*d.* could be earned by a good school for elementary instruction, then I say you have no right to compel the authorities of those schools to show you that it has cost 17*s.* 6*d.* to arrive at this state of efficiency. If you have to pay for the result, all you have to do is to look at the result which is brought before you. Under the existing state of things, if a school has earned £50 by its state of efficiency and the amount of education given in the school, but cannot show that there has been a sum of £50 subscribed in the neighbourhood, then the school is mulcted to the extent of the sum of money between the money subscribed and the money earned —that is, if it is entitled to £50 and the amount subscribed reaches only £40, then it only gets £40 from the Government—that is, £10 less than it ought to receive. This discourages managers and teachers alike, and the proposal now made will place the schools in a much more healthy condition. We do not propose to increase the grant, nor do we propose to take any power to relax the terms on which money is so earned. Provision is made in the Bill for the Education Department to interfere with the school boards or local authorities, who fail in their duties to carry out the provisions of the Act. That, we think, will be a provision of very considerable importance. I now come to the clause providing for the dissolution of school boards under certain circumstances. This proposal elicited a great deal of criticism in the other House. First of all, a school board is only abolished where there is no building; and, secondly, where such a board is considered to be unnecessary, and where the body who in the first instance called the school board into existence by a bare majority decide by a majority of two-thirds that they are dissatisfied with the system of having a school board in that parish; and, further, it must be proved to the satisfaction of the Education Department that maintenance of the Board is no longer necessary for the education purposes of the district; thereon the Department may order the dissolution of the school board. There is a provision enacting that school boards in large towns may provide themselves with offices, and pay for them out of the rates in the same way as they pay for new schools. In some of the large towns there is great necessity for offices, but as at present there are no means to pay for them the boards are obliged to hire a building for that purpose. Then there is an important provision as to vacancies which may occur upon the boards during the period of three years for which the parties have been elected, and which vacancies, it is provided, may be filled up by the members of the board. As your Lordships are aware, in the large towns—such as Manchester and Liverpool—the cost of an election is very great, and this provision is intended to prevent the cost of an election in the event of a vacancy occurring within the three years; therefore it is proposed that casual vacancies shall be filled up by the boards themselves, as in Scotland. Lastly, there is a provision to enable the Education Department to certify that a school is efficient, though it is other than a public elementary school, if it is not conducted for private profit, if it is subject to the same regulations as to attendance and registration as in public elementary schools, and is open to the inspection of Her Majesty's Inspectors. These, my Lords, are the main principles of the Bill. There are others of some importance on which I might touch, but I do not wish to detain your Lordships at too great length. My Lords, the object of this Bill is by no means to injure or impair school boards—on the contrary, there are provisions in it which I believe those bodies will find both useful and acceptable—I mean those referring to the filling up of vacancies, the setting at rest of the question as to the raising of loans for industrial schools, the building of offices, the repeal of the 25th clause of the existing Act, and the transference to Boards of Guardians of the duty of paying fees. In conclusion, I have to express my belief that if your Lordships agree to the second reading of this Bill you will have made a step in advance in education at which all persons who have the interest and welfare of the country at heart will have cause to rejoice.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President.*)

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, my first duty in rising to address your Lordships on this subject is to acknowledge—which I do cheerfully—the spirit of conciliation in which the noble Duke has spoken, and the manner in which he has referred to the operation of the Act which was passed by the late Government. There is one point, however, to which he has not in any way referred, but which I think calls for some attention, and that is the very late period of the Session at which this most important Bill comes before us. Some seven years ago this House refused to proceed even with the consideration of an Education Bill, because it came up so late as the 9th of August, and that notwithstanding the fact that this House had previously discussed its provisions, and had only to consider certain Amendments made by the House of Commons. I wonder whether the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees will repeat to-night the question which he put on that occasion—namely, whether it is fair to this House to bring before it an important Bill within a few days of the end of the Session? For myself, I will not ask whether Her Majesty's Government by pursuing this course is not making this House a mere instrument for registering the proceedings of the House of Commons; but this I will say, that the arguments which governed your Lordships on the occasion to which I have referred seven years ago apply with ten-fold force to the present Bill, which is of the highest importance, and which practically comes before us to-day—the 8th of August—for the first time. There is a very great difference between the position of the present Government and that of the late Government in this matter. When the late Government brought forward their Bill, they did so with the full knowledge that this House could mould it as they liked; but with regard to this Bill I appeal to your Lordships whether we on this side of the House are not absolutely helpless. What chance have we of making any change in this Bill whatever at this period of the Session? But I need not dwell on this point. I would now refer to what the noble Duke has said with respect to the character of the Bill. I am glad to hear the changes that have been made in the Bill during its passage through the other House, and which have got rid of many of the objections I entertained in the first instance. Not long after this measure was introduced in the other House I had occasion to make some remarks on it out-of-doors, and I then said, among other things, that I regretted the principle of indirect compulsion which had been adopted, because I was afraid it would prove both inefficient and invidious. I think the noble Duke, in referring to this matter, has rather misapprehended the great change which has been made in the Bill since its introduction. One of the reasons why I originally objected to the Bill, was that while it did not force a child up to 10 years of age to go to school, it did prohibit him from going to labour. A more worthless mode of bringing up a child than was thus laid down I could not conceive. But the Bill now contains an entirely different provision. Not only is the child prevented from going to labour, but he is forced to attend school up to the age of 10. Again, the Bill, as originally drawn, discouraged the half-time system. Now I am happy to say it has the contrary effect. After 10 years of age a child, unless he has obtained an education certificate, is prohibited from labouring except on half-time. There is, I think, some objection as to the mode in which compulsion is carried out. I do not know whether your Lordships have read the evidence taken by the Agricultural Employment Commissioners, in which the difficulty raised by the question of certificates is referred to. One of the objections there taken to the provision of the Bill in respect to certificates is that an immense army of Inspectors will be required to carry it out effectively. With regard to the Bill generally, I quite agree with the noble Duke that it marks a great step forward in education; because it establishes the principle that it is the duty of a parent to educate his child, and that if he does not do that the State will take the function upon itself, and will inflict penalties upon him. In that respect undoubtedly the Bill contains an important and valuable contribution to the cause of education. The noble Duke particularly called my attention to the proposed day industrial schools, and then proceeded—though I think with some hesitation—to commend them very strongly. Well, I am not going to enter into the political economy part of the question.—I would merely observe that my noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury), who in this matter of the education of the poor has never shown any great inclination to yield to the doctrines of political economists, has expressed the strongest possible opinion against these day industrial schools, and I believe he would have been here to-day to address your Lordships on the subject had he not felt how utterly hopeless it was to attempt to amend the Bill at this period of the Session. A member of the London School Board, Mr. John M'Gregor, in a letter to *The Times*, has also expressed himself opposed to the establishment of schools of this kind. What I understand to be proposed is this—That certain children are to be sent to these industrial schools, where they will be more or less in prison and under strict surveillance, and not only be educated, but taught some kind of industry; but that for nearly two-thirds of their time they will be perfectly free on week-days and, possibly, during the whole of Sunday to profit by the increased intelligence which their schooling may have developed in learning the bad habits from which it is most desirable to wean them. Again, enormous outlay will be incurred in erecting schools of this kind in the large towns with every appliance and in the most expensive localities, because there is to be a school within a limited distance of the place where the children live. That, I confess, seems to me a very wild scheme; and my own consolation is that by an Amendment made in the other House the whole thing is to be put under the discretion of the Home Secretary, whereby much of the mischief that would otherwise be produced will probably be averted. The noble Duke then spoke of the new mode of giving aid to schools not under a school board. He stated that the Bill had been framed in no spirit of hostility to school boards. I did express some time ago a fear that there was an undue amount of hostility to school boards; and even in the provisions of the measure as they come up now to us I think there is such a spirit shown. I admit that some advantages are given to school boards—with regard, for example, to the filling up of casual vacancies, with regard to offices, and one or two other petty matters. But when you give aid to the denominational schools without the safeguard which has hitherto existed, that the grant should bear some proportion to the voluntary subscription of the district, I do say you handicap one class of schools most unfavourably as against another. Objection has been taken to the great advantage thus given to denominational schools; but is it clear that this will operate ultimately for the benefit of the denominations? Do you believe that, when the denominational schools go on entirely deprived of voluntary subscriptions, in a number of years they will be allowed to be regarded otherwise than as State schools? When they rest on the Government grant without voluntary assistance, I believe that in a certain length of time you will have a claim which it will be impossible to resist to take a more complete State control over these schools. Then, with respect to the 25th clause, no responsibility attaches to the Education Department. Whether it was originally right or wrong, the 25th clause had come to be generally accepted as a compromise, and though it had at one time caused considerable dispute, it was at last working very well. But the Government, almost in a sort of panic, re-opened the whole question, and it is impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that this unnecessary disturbance of a matter on which there existed acquiescence will probably rouse bitter and angry controversy again in many parts of the country. Now, while I think some of the provisions of the Bill are very good—so good that I shall vote for the second reading—I may state that I will not give Notice of very important Amendments to be proposed in Committee, because, as must be felt on both sides of the House, it would be perfectly abortive, and indeed an absolute farce, to attempt anything of the kind. Your Lordships will remember the old play in which a man finds his chimney smoking very badly. His first impulse is to complain to his landlord; but he is afraid that it might give his landlord the idea of raising his rent. And so I am afraid that if I gave Notice of Amendments it might encourage some independent Members of your Lordships' House to propose other Amendments of a strongly re-actionary character—Amendments to which, judging from their conduct in the other House, the Government might be tempted to accede. Therefore I shall not trouble your Lordships by submitting Amendments which I feel I have not the remotest chance of carrying within a few days of the Prorogation of Parliament.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, at this period of the Session, and considering the way in which this matter has been so fully debated "elsewhere," it can hardly be desirable to detain your Lordships at any length. But, at the same time, I think I should hardly be doing my duty if I did not express some opinion on the merits of this Bill, which it seems is absolutely certain to become the law of the land whether this House prolongs or shortens the discussion. I am the more anxious to say a few words because, although nothing can be more kindly than the feeling with which the Bill has been discussed in this House, your Lordships are perfectly aware that in the country generally there has been a good deal of agitation on the subject of the measure: and, as representing the Church of which I have the honour to be the Chief Minister, I cannot allow one or two remarks to pass which have been made as to the tendency of the Bill and the reasons why it has been acquiesced in by the clergy of the Church of England. I think that observations have been made with reference to the zeal of the clergy on the subject of education which are of a somewhat unkind and ungenerous character. It would almost appear as if some thought that that enormous sum of money which from 1811 down to the end of the year 1874 was produced by the voluntary exertions of members of the Church of England in order to promote the education of the poor—namely, some £27,000,000 sterling—had been collected rather in the spirit of a Pharisaical desire to make converts than with any real love for the children of the poor and a desire to have them thoroughly instructed. I cannot help thinking that elsewhere we have been represented as being anxious to compass sea and land in order to make one convert, that when we had gained him we might make him two-fold more bigoted and uncharitable then we are ourselves. I believe that any who have cast such blame on the exertions not only of the clergy, but of the laity also, of the Church of England in this matter must be sorry by this time for what they have said. My own experience is that there is nothing dearer to the hearts either of the clergy or of the attached laity of the Church of England than the instruction of the children of the poor—not for the sake of attaching them to this or to that sect, but for the sake of conferring on them the greatest benefit which it is in our power to bestow. The only further remark I would make on this subject is that if there be any bigotry in the matter it is not all on one side. This Bill has been represented as a concession to the Church of England. I am disposed to think that it has considerable advantages as being likely ultimately to promote the cause of religious education; and, though I am aware that the religious education of the country is very greatly in the hands of the Church of England, yet I have still to learn that when I speak of the religious education of the country I am speaking in the interests solely of the Church of England. In the discussions elsewhere it has been taken for granted that if you promote religious education you necessarily promote the interests of the Church of England. Certainly no greater compliment could be paid to the Church of England than by this assumption. But still, my Lords, we are not to depart from facts. I hold in my hand the Return printed by your Lordships' House at the beginning of this Session of the number of schools, denominational and others, in this country. The denominational schools of the Church of England are in an enormous majority. But I find 2,000 other schools not complying with the regulations of school boards, which I suppose refused to comply with them because they thought these regulations did not sufficiently maintain the religious instruction of the country; and these 2,000 schools are schools of Nonconformists, who certainly cannot have identified religion with the maintenance of the Church of England. Therefore, when I argue that it is good if this Bill has done anything—though it be but a little —for the cause of religious education, I altogether deny that I am only representing that community of which I am a minister. I am speaking in the name of all the religious communities, not excluding the Roman Catholic community, which has so many schools of its own; and I believe we are acting very consistently with the principles of the Act of 1870, if we are very carefully on our guard against any unexpected consequences, which are gradually pushing those religious schools into the shade and making it an absolute necessity for them in the course of time, against the intention of the promoters of the Bill of 1870, to be superseded by board schools. The Roman Catholic body have, as I see, 598 schools of their own. I should like to know why they are to be forced on account of their poverty to surrender these schools, and to send their children to board schools? I do not know, if I were a conscientious Roman Catholic, that anything would induce me, if it were possible for me to secure for them that particular religious instruction which I should so highly prize, to send my children to a school where they could not possibly obtain it. And if Roman Catholics may hold this opinion, I do not see why Wesleyan Methodists are not to hold it—and I know that they do. I know, too, if you travel beyond the Border you will certainly find in the northern parts of this Island many persons who have no great desire for the maintenance of the Established Church of England, but who have the strongest determination that they will have their children taught according to that creed which they themselves prize; and I have yet to learn that the Nonconformists of the South have so entirely separated themselves from their brethren of the Westminster Confession as not—many of them, at least—still to desire that they should have if they please the right of instructing their children according to those beliefs which they so greatly prize. Therefore, I think it is an unfair assumption that, if this Bill does in any way remove the disadvantages which have accidentally arisen in the way of the Act of 1870, and have made it less conducive to the maintenance of fair play to all parties, that alteration is necessarily one which has been made simply for the benefit of the Church of England. Now, my Lords, if I wished to prove that this Bill is not particularly satisfactory to those who are in favour of religious education, I should have no difficulty in making good that point. I am thankful for small mercies. I am therefore glad that anything has been done which shall upon the whole give to the instruction of this country more of a religious character. But still when we are met with something like a loud outcry that this is a great concession made to the advocates of denominational and religious education, we are bound to consider for a moment what the demands of those who are in favour of religious education are, and how far they have been incorporated in this Bill. I hold in my hand the resolutions proposed at a great meeting, held with the view of influencing the Government with respect to this measure. At that meeting it was observed with regret

> "that the Elementary Education Bill, now before the House of Commons, does not include in its provisions any satisfactory recognition of the general desire of the country for adequate religious instruction in all elementary schools."

I hold in my hand another set of resolutions of the National Education Union, and their proposals are these—

> "That, notwithstanding anything contained in Clause 14 of the Act of 1870, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments may be taught in schools provided by School Boards.
>
> "That it may be made a condition for the receipt of a Parliamentary Grant in the case of a Board School that religious instruction should be given therein, and that such instruction should consist of at least the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments.

> "That all Public Elementary Schools should be exempt from local rates,"

and so on. These were the proposals of the favourers of denominational education at the time that the country first began to discuss this Bill. I am sorry to say there is not a concession made to us that I know of in one of these respects; and since I entered the House this day I have been waited upon by a deputation begging me to do what I agree with the noble Earl (Earl Granville) would be useless—namely, to propose an Amendment that the Bible should be read in every board and other school throughout the country. I believe if I proposed that in this House the proposal would have an echo in the country. I believe it is true that the country, having been appealed to on this matter, is in favour of religious education; that it knows there is no real and true good education which is not religious; and I think I might almost cite even the Gentleman who represents the Birmingham School Board, as himself bearing testimony to the fact. For the Secularists appear to me at this moment to have awakened to the consciousness that they are very weak in the country, and, therefore, what they say is, not that they hold a secular education is the real education, but that it is to be the only public education, and that the other is so sacred a thing that it must be carried on privately and by voluntary effort. Whether they are right or wrong in this view, I am confident, my Lords, that they have not the voice of the country with them; because we are all aware that if the children of the poor in the present state of education and religion in the country do not receive religious instruction by the public means which are taken to secure it, they are but little likely to receive it at all. My Lords, I think the voice of the country in this matter is shown by the proceedings of the school boards. Some gentleman was at the trouble to collect, with very great care, all the different rules and regulations which were made by the school boards throughout the country, in order to show how hopeless was the task they had undertaken of teaching religion without teaching any particular religion. Well, I grant that he made out a tolerably good case; but I think the evidence which he collected was more distinctly conclusive on this point than on the point to which he directed our attention—namely, that, in spite of all the regulations you may introduce, to say there is to be no dogmatic teaching in your public schools, men cannot do without it, and, whether by right or by wrong methods, by subterfuge or openly, they will endeavour to introduce something in the nature of dogmatic teaching. What is dogmatic teaching? I hold in my hands a little extract which I read the other day of what has been prepared for France in this matter by the very eminent man who carried the knowledge acquired by him at Rugby, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, to the regulation of public instruction in the country of his birth—

> "Clause II.—From the age of ten the pupils of both sexes"—this is in the French elementary schools—"shall sedulously receive general notions on the existence of God, on the immortality of the soul, on morals, and on the organic principles of Republican Government."

I presume the last would imply some very dogmatic statements indeed. The paper seems to be drawn up by M. Waddington:—it is highly probable that it has not been adopted; but it shows what is occurring in a country which desires to shake off all dogmatic teaching, and to get entirely free from this nightmare. I mention these things because I think it will be found that ultimately the good sense and the religious feeling of this country will more and more gravitate towards a religious education. I do not know that we shall have very strict denominational education; but I am quite sure that if the country is to be what we all trust it will be in the ages that lie before us, it will gravitate towards a really religious education. I have said that I have received many suggestions to make Amendments in this Bill in this direction. They came from persons quite above suspicion of not being in accord with the general love of progress which characterizes this 19th century. One gentleman of long experience as a Government Inspector of Schools begs me to remember what Lord John Russell and Sir George Grey did in this direction in a former time, when old Constitutional and Liberal principles had not given way to any theories of doctrinaire Radicalism. One, as being a pupil of Arnold, begs me to secure that something representing Arnold's hearty love of religious education shall find its way into this Bill. I hold in my hand, also, a Petition, which I ought to have presented some time ago, urging the same point. As we have failed, therefore, to obtain any of the particular benefits which we might have hoped for from a revision of the legislation of 1870, I think it is particularly hard that we should be exposed to obloquy because we have obtained in this Bill a slight instalment of that which is neither more nor less than simple justice. The noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond) has quoted the opinions of the Government of 1870, when they brought forward the Bill of that year; and when we consider the line adopted by one eminent man, to whom the country owes, perhaps, more than to any other for his labours in the cause of education during the last six years, I cannot but believe that to remedy now the inconveniences which have arisen from the unforeseen working of the Act of 1870 is simply an act of justice. It is because, firstly, we have no chance of getting any more; and, secondly, because we think it fair, on the whole, to acquiesce in the legislation of 1870, that we, the clergy of the Church of England, have made up our minds to do our best to support this Bill. It is not that we are quite satisfied with it. I would have everybody to understand that we wish for a great deal more; but we cannot get it. We think it right, therefore, to acquiesce in that which is, on the whole, a fair compromise. Very much the same thing happened in 1870. We differed altogether from parts of the legislation of 1870, but thought, on the whole, it was fair to all parties. Now, as then, we ask only for a fair field and no favour; and this is what we think the Bill does for the poor schools throughout the country. In the poor districts, if there was, to use the noble Earl's (Earl Granville's) expression, any "handicapping," it certainly was not in favour of the denominational schools. They had to contend with persons who had a bottomless purse at their disposal, and who alone could compel the attendance of the children; and, therefore, they had very little chance of fighting their way in a fair field which it was the intention of the Act of 1870 to secure for them. I think they will have a fair field now, and therefore I, for one, am quite ready to acquiesce in the Bill—though I should be very glad, if this were not now the 8th of August, to ask that the Bible should be read in all the schools. At this period of the Session, however, there is no use in making such a proposal. Now, what is the great aim of this Bill? I suppose it is to educate by compulsion. I do not think compulsion the highest or most desirable mode of securing education. The only object of having compulsion is in order that, for a generation or two, you may convince men of the blessings of education who are at present not sufficiently educated themselves to understand and appreciate these blessings. I hope, however, the time will come when you may repeal the clauses as to compulsion, and when parents will be as unwilling to deprive a child of his education as they would be to starve him, and so deprive him of his natural food. I have alluded to the country on the other side of the Tweed, and cannot help mentioning what was told me by one now deceased (the late Mr. Edward Ellice), of his recollections of the Highlands in his early days, when the shepherds on the remote mountains were so desirous that their children should be educated, that during the summer they sent them to schools many miles distant, over hill and flood, and during the winter took care that their children should not want teachers, for the boys from the schools in the nearest towns were then lent out to act as private tutors in these shepherds' hovels. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of such a measure as this, if it really fulfils the purpose for which it is intended. Nations change their character very rapidly. A year or two of slavery or of licence altogether destroys the character of a nation; and a single generation of well-enforced compulsory education may, and I trust will, so influence for good the generation which follows that compulsion may become altogether unnecessary. For these reasons I shall support the Bill.

The Marquess of RIPON said, that as one of the authors of the Act of 1870, of which he had charge in this House, he asked permission to say a few words upon the present Bill. Its main object was to extend more widely than at present the system of compulsory attendance at schools. Now, he confessed he was one of those old-fashioned people—of whom, perhaps, there were now not many on either side of the House—who looked with jealousy and with close scrutiny upon any proposal for extending the principle of compulsion and for interfering with the freedom of private life. That jealousy was a sound one as a general rule, and it was particularly sound with respect to interference between parent and child; because the relation between parent and child was so sacred that we ought to be very careful in any steps we took that might tend to weaken it. But though he held this opinion, he did not, of course, say there were not cases in which it might be just and necessary that the State should step in to see that a parent performed his duty to his child; and he quite accepted the principle laid down in Clause 4 of the Bill, that it was the duty of a parent to provide efficient elementary education for his child. He thought, however, it was very desirable that we should closely scrutinize proposals of this kind when made from time to time—because their justice depended entirely on the way in which compulsion was applied. It ought to be applied in a manner which carefully guarded to the utmost possible extent the free choice of the parent as to the school to which his child should be sent. The compulsion proposed by this Bill was of two kinds, direct and indirect. He had heard with some surprise the statement of the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Richmond), that there was no direct compulsion in this Bill. It appeared to him that when their Lordships went into Committee they would find there was a very stringent provision for direct compulsion throughout the country. He would not now go into details, but he should desire to make some remarks when the Bill was in Committee on the way in his noble Friend proposed to apply both direct and indirect compulsion. He rejoiced that an Amendment proposed in the other House by his noble Friend (Lord Frederick Cavendish) had been introduced into the Bill, which Amendment would enable the half-time system to be adopted in rural districts. He hoped that the extension of compulsion would in a few years become unnecessary, and that the value of education would be appreciated throughout the country; but he entertained some fear as to the possible consequences of extending the system—especially of direct compulsion—to what he might call single-school districts. In many places there was a single school in connection with the Established Church, to which school all the children in the parish, speaking generally, were in the habit of going with perfect satisfaction, under a system which worked very quietly and efficiently. Englishmen were, however, very often ready to do willingly what they would not do by compulsion, and he feared it might turn out that the effect of this Bill would be to disturb the harmonious working of the present system—although no one would be more glad than he to find himself wrong in this supposition. He was well aware there were many persons in this country who would say that such difficulties as he had described would be entirely got rid of by the general establishment of what were called unsectarian schools. He could not share the opinion that that system would tend to get rid of the religious difficulty, although it might possibly alter the phase of that difficulty. Although unsectarian schools might be very acceptable to a considerable number of persons, they would, on the other hand, be extremely unacceptable to others. On this point he would cite the testimony of Dr. Rigg, the head of the Wesleyan Training College at Westminster, and for some years a member of the London School Board. That gentleman said—

> "The instruction, indeed, is called 'unsectarian;' but to a Roman Catholic it is sectarian, being a form of generically Protestant instruction out of the Scriptures. So to the Deist, the Rationalist, the 'advanced liberal' Unitarian Christian, it is a form of sectarian and dogmatic instruction, opposed to his 'conscientious convictions.' So far as the instruction goes it is a broad Protestant form of Biblical Christianity, and favours certain Christian sects in common, to the exclusion of other religious communities professedly Christian, or perhaps, also, professedly non-Christian."

That appeared to him to be a perfectly fair statement of the case. His own belief was, that under any system of State-aided schools the so-called religious difficulty could not be wholly got rid of, but it might be reduced to a minimum; and, in fact, it had been reduced to a minimum, by the system established in 1870. His noble Friend who spoke second in this debate (Earl Granville), made some remarks with respect to the proposed increase of grants from the Education Department. The grants were not to be made exclusively to denominational schools, but to all schools; though, no doubt, a change was about to be made in the conditions on which those grants were issued. It did not appear to him that the proposed increase was fairly open to the objection of his noble Friend. That objection was based on the ground that the clause would have the effect of getting rid of the local and private subscriptions in the great majority of voluntary schools. If he entertained that opinion he should be inclined to think that such a proposal would be very injurious to the interests of denominational schools; but he did not believe that the result alluded to would be at all general. There were, moreover, under the system of 1870, schools which were supported exclusively by the Government grant and by school fees. These were schools belonging chiefly to the Wesleyan and other Nonconformist Bodies. Therefore the principle of schools without voluntary subscriptions had been admitted ever since the passing of the Act of 1870. A good deal had been said about the clause which provided for the dissolution of certain school boards, and he for one very much regretted that the Government, who had not originally proposed that clause, should have given way with respect to it to their more ardent and less discreet Friends. The clause, he believed, would have no very appreciable effect, but it might have the effect of stirring up animosities and raising questions that he hoped had been set at rest. There was nothing which, for his own part, he more strongly deprecated than the existence of a hostile antagonism between denominational and board schools. There ought, he thought, to be between them only a friendly rivalry as to which could do most in the public interest and for the cause of education. There was, he believed, room for both classes of schools in the country, and good work to be accomplished by both. Having said thus much, he would observe that he could not concur in the language which was sometimes used as to the effect of the present Bill upon the policy of the Act of 1870. The noble Earl who spoke second (Earl Granville) spoke of that Act, as was commonly done, as being a compromise. Well, some of the wisest measures which had been passed by the Parliament of England had been the results of compromise; and in that way much of the violence and revolution which characterized the history of other countries had, he believed, been avoided. But if those who employed the word "compromise" with respect to the Act of 1870 meant thereby to imply that it was devoid of principle, then that was an interpretation of it which he begged most distinctly to repudiate. He for one was proud of having been permitted to play even an humble part in that great legislation; for what was the policy of the Act of 1870? It was based on the history of education in this country. Its object was to make the utmost use of that which was good in the existing system and at the same time to adopt such new provisions as would speedily bring within the reach of every child in the Kingdom the means of elementary education. The first principle of the measure was to take advantage of those great forces, chiefly religious, which had in the past done so much for the cause of public education, to accept what they had done, and to aid them to do more. The second was the introduction of a new force to supplement those more ancient forces, so that schools might be established throughout the length and breadth of the land. The third and last principle was cautiously and tentatively to make trial of a system of compulsory education, while scrupulously respecting the free right of choice of the parent as to the school to which his child should go. Those were the principles on which the Act of 1870 was framed; and what had been the result? In six years, under the operation of that legislation, the school accommodation had been increased to the extent of 1,380,487, of which accommodation for nearly 1,000,000 had been supplied by voluntary efforts. The average attendance during these six years had increased by 659,798, the certificated teachers by 9,925, and the pupil teachers by the enormous number of 16,286. The legislation of 1870 had produced these great results. He believed that its policy was as sound in principle as it had been rich in results, and he trusted that policy might long continue to guide them in the future.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: We have, my Lords, the happiness to have arrived at a somewhat calmer discussion of this subject than those through which this measure has so recently passed. Two Ministers who were principally responsible for the Act of 1870 have spoken this evening, and both of them have told us that they are not prepared to move the rejection of the Bill. It is impossible to listen to such an announcement without reflecting that the Colleagues of those noble Lords in "another place" have sent it up to us with anything but their blessing, but with an anathema, and that one of them (Mr. Goschen) voted against the third reading. It is another satisfactory proof of the calmness of our deliberations, or perhaps it may be due to the smaller attendance, that a more sober view is taken of the Bill by the two noble Lords of whom I am speaking than by their Colleagues in the other House. It was, of course, the duty of the noble Earl who spoke second (Earl Granville) to find some fault with the measure, and I quite sympathize with the difficulty he has had to encounter in doing so. He seems to think that a great indignity has been offered to this House in its having been sent up to us at so late a period of the Session; but that is a charge which if true ought to have been addressed to his Friends in the other House, where five days were taken up in the discussion of a single clause. The noble Earl cited the precedent of the Scotch Education Act of 1869; but I think he must have forgotten the circumstances of that case. That Bill, after long and anxious discussion in this House, and having been largely amended, was sent down to the House of Commons. There the Lord Advocate in one night, and without discussion, by force of the overwhelming majority at his command, re-introduced all those clauses which this House had struck out; and then the Bill was contemptuously sent back for our acceptance on the 9th of August. There was a great difference between that Bill and this Bill. That Bill was sent up to us in known and contemptuous disregard of our opinion; this Bill has been sent here with the general knowledge that it is highly acceptable to your Lordships. The noble Earl (Earl Granville) has referred to the clauses relating to day industrial schools, and he dwelt upon the perfect futility of giving children education during the day which would be rendered more than useless by the wickedness they would learn from their parents at night. But I think the noble Earl can hardly have reflected that that is a formidable objection to any education of the lower classes at all. There must be many poor persons in the community who will be liable to temptations; and if you lay down that profligate companionship is not only to neutralize the advantage of the education given, but to make that education a positive evil, you throw very great doubt upon the policy of general compulsory education. I should concur with the noble Earl in doubting the policy as to these wastrel clauses if it was intended to make them universal in all parishes. Undoubtedly, it is exceptional legislation. It is aimed at an exceptional fact — the terrible condition of some children—the wandering and unclaimed children of our large towns. This is one of the greatest evils and sorest disgraces of our highly-civilized social life, and you must apply such remedies as may seem equal to meeting it; but you must not imagine that remedies suitable for an unusual and exceptional disease can be applicable to all states of society. The noble Earl went through what I may call the 17*s.* 6*d.* clause; but it is not necessary to say much in answering him on this point. He said that it was inconsistent with the Act of 1870. Happily, we have the great High Priest of that Act with us, and he tells us that there is nothing inconsistent between them. I do not venture to interfere between two authorities so great. We do not confine this 17*s.* 6*d.* to voluntary schools; if we did it would be handicapping them in the race. We give precisely the same advantage to the two competitors, and it cannot be said that preference is given to one over the other. The noble Earl forgets that all these voluntary schools have been built almost entirely by voluntary effort—if I may so speak of it, the business has been started by the capital of the voluntary people. After all, the real answer to the complaint is that the assistance of 17*s.* 6*d.* is to be given in no case until the children display the proficiency required by the Council of Education. Surely, where this proficiency was shown, it would be no ground on which to refuse the assistance to say that it was done by voluntary effort? If the voluntary school passed the tests of the Education Department it had a right to the payment. As to the references made to the Act of 1870, and the understanding then come to, no doubt that Act was passed by an understanding. Its passing was not characterized by what we have lately witnessed—by discussions of five nights in length. If the Act of 1870 had been met with the same spirit as the Bill of 1876 has been met with, the Act of 1870 would never have reached the Statute Book. The Act of 1870 maintained, generally speaking, a fair neutrality between the board system and the voluntary system: leaving to each locality a free choice between the two systems. But there was one exception to that impartiality. While the Act provided for a change from a denominational to a board school, it refused to sanction a change from a board school to a denominational school. As long as that inequality existed you could not say that the subject was dealt with in a fair and even-handed manner by the Act of 1870. I agree that this clause will not have a large effect. I have no doubt it will relieve a feeling of soreness in this country, but it will not have a large general effect. It will have a moral and indirect effect in another way. It will announce to the country that the State is absolutely impartial between the two systems, and that wherever people are willing to support denominational education, the State will allow that denominational education to be pursued. I think there is nothing in this Bill to justify the belief that it is, in any way, a great or special concession to the Church of England. I believe it is a concession to what is called denominational education or sectarian education. It is a concession to religious education resting upon doctrinal or sectarian teaching; but even to that extent the concession is a small one. As the most rev. Prelate has pointed out, those who are in favour of doctrinal education are anxious for more than they have received; but this Bill has not granted to them everything which will directly stimulate religious education or which will require any form of religious education as a condition of State aid. Our refusal does not arise from indifference to the subject on the part of the Government. It is not because we disagree with those who believe that religious education by the will of the people of this country will always be the predominant education. We have not thought it necessary to approach this subject in the way to which I refer, because we feel confident that there is so thorough a conviction in all parts of the country that no education which is not a religious education is worthy the State to give or the child to receive—because the Government have the full conviction that the people will remain firm on this point, and will yield to no temptation. We felt that, therefore, we could properly and safely avoid a subject full of difficulties, and that we were not called upon to lay on the Table a Bill that should contain a direct provision requiring religious education as a condition of State aid. The most rev. Prelate told us that coercive education was merely a preparation for that period when the attachment of the people to education should be so determined that coercion would be no longer necessary; because if public opinion on that head was as thorough as could be wished coercive measures would not be necessary. They are now necessary as regards secular education because the need of it is not fully felt by all classes of the population. What he has said of education generally is pre-eminently true of religious education. It is the very universality of the feeling in favour of religious education that has made us feel we could safely avoid a subject so full of difficulties, and lay the Bill upon the Table in its present shape. We have laid down no direct provision for religious education simply because we are convinced that it is unnecessary and not from any feeling that religious education is not desired by the people of England.

LORD ABERDARE thought he would be a bold man who should state that he did not know that this Bill could not possibly receive at this period of the Session, the consideration which the importance of its subject required. He would appeal to the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury), himself to say whether the Bill would now receive the same amount of consideration that would have been bestowed upon it if it had been brought up to that House a month ago? Here was a most important measure consisting of upwards of 60 clauses —yet such was the period of the Session that it was quite useless for any noble

Lord, however interested, to propose any important modification during its progress through Committee. In refering to the opposition which the measure had lately encountered, the noble Marquess appeared to him to be somewhat unjust towards the Members and supporters of the late Government, for not only was the principle of the measure accepted by them, but some of them actually delivered powerful and effective speeches in its favour. What they had taken exception to was not the principle of the Bill as it was originally drawn, but the changes which the Government had subsequently introduced into it. As to the Conscience Clause, which was formerly so much opposed, it was now asserted to be necessary. In Church schools, for the most part, the spirit of the Conscience Clause was no doubt observed; but those schools were undoubtedly pervaded by influences to which Dissenters with great reason were unwilling to subject their children. Would any noble Lord who was a member of the Established Church care to send his child to a Roman Catholic or Unitarian school, however strict the Conscience Clause then in operation might be? He was sure no noble Lord would willingly run the risk involved in doing such a thing. The Nonconformists, on the same principle, preferred board schools for their children, because they felt that there they would be protected. But by the extension of the powers of the Guardians and Town Councils under this Bill the injustice previously felt by the Nonconformists was materially aggravated, and it was not surprising that they should look on the Bill with disfavour; it was not, however, till the Government accepted Amendments still more hostile to their interests that they had opposed the measure in any really determined spirit. Whatever faults it might have, the school-board system was accepted by the Dissenters, and it was only natural that their distrust should be excited when the Government accepted the Amendments referred to. When the subject was discussed in 1870 it was argued that the local contributions might be looked upon as the means of providing the religious part of education, and the Government grant as the means of providing the secular part; and the great objection raised to the present Bill was that under it they might have the denominational schools entirely supported from grants out of the taxes. The clergyman of a rural parish would increase his school fees; with the assistance of the compulsory system he might compel the attendance of the children; if the parents could not pay the fees the Guardians would have to find the money; and thus the denominational system would be maintained by State funds without any local contributions. In the Bill of the Government there was a very considerable defect in respect to compulsion. Town Councils, if they thought proper, would be able at once to frame compulsory bye-laws, and Boards of Guardians would be required to appoint committees to compel school attendance up to the age of 10; but between the ages of 10 and 14 compulsion could only be adopted on the requisition of the inhabitants of the parish. Now he believed it would be found that just in proportion as a parish needed a compulsory system would there be an objection to it among the inhabitants. He admitted it was a great improvement to provide, as the Bill did, that a child must be educated up to the age of 10; but in a parish without compulsory bye-laws the child might then escape from all education if he either obtained a certificate of having passed an examination in Standard IV—to which he had no objection—or had a certificate showing that he had attended school for 125 days during the year. Now he wanted to know why all children should not be required to pass a standard of proficiency?—especially when they remembered how careless many parents were in regard to the education their children received. Irregular attendance at school was one of the greatest difficulties against which teachers had to struggle; and he thought they should require that the child should have been regular and diligent in his attendance. An attendance of 125 days was quite insufficient; and, moreover, the fixing of the *minimum* number of attendances by Act of Parliament had this evil effect, that the parents and children always seized on the *minimum*, and made it their *maximum*, contenting themselves with doing only what was absolutely necessary to obtain the object for which the conditions were imposed. Again, if the House was earnest about education, they ought not to limit to the age of 10. Canon Norris, one of the most eminent

Inspectors, had made a special inquiry as to the hold which the elementary education given in the schools had had on the working classes in Staffordshire, and he showed that just in proportion as a child left school at an early age did he loose all, or nearly all, the benefit he had received as far as regarded the elements of instruction. They ought to compel attendances at least up to the age of 13, and more than attendance for 125 days in the year should be exacted from children who were relieved from the necessity of passing an examination in the Fourth Standard. In conclusion, he thought it was of little advantage making speeches on the second reading of the Bill unless they were followed up by Amendments in Committee; but as the noble Duke had informed them that the Committee would be taken on Thursday, proper time would not be allowed for putting Notices of Amendments on the Paper.

LORD HAMPTON said, he looked upon the Act of 1870 as a great measure, and he felt grateful to the Government that had brought it in; and one of the reasons why he was disposed to give this Bill a most cordial support was, because he regarded it as a worthy sequel to that Act. But he must join those who had preceded him, in expressing his deep regret that what he believed to be the most important measure of the present Session should have been brought before their Lordships at so late a period of the Session—at a time, indeed, so late that it was utterly impossible to consider it adequately. He did not impute blame to his noble Friends on the Treasury Bench—they had been the victims of circumstances. The one cause which more than any other had led to this Bill being sent up to their Lordships so near to the close of the Session was, the unduly warm discussions which arose in the other House of Parliament on the clause for the dissolution of school boards in certain cases. He could not understand how by any Party in the House of Commons that clause could have been considered worth the angry feeling and waste of time to which it had led. With regard to the Bill itself, he looked upon it as a most valuable step towards the completion of the general education of the country. If Her Majesty's Government had decided to introduce into the Bill a provision for direct compulsion he would have been ready to support it; but, to the best of his judgment, the Government had taken a wiser course. They had done well, when it became necessary that compulsion should be resorted to, to try the experiment of indirect compulsion; if that failed, direct compulsion could be resorted to. If the provisions of this Bill were entirely and sincerely carried out throughout the country, he believed they would go a long way to avert the necessity for stronger measures. There was one point in the Bill which was worthy of all praise, and that was the proposal to put Boards of Guardians in the position of school boards, so as to make it less necessary that school boards should be adopted all over the country. He did not join in the objection felt to school boards by some with whom he generally agreed. He did not object to school boards. On the contrary, he believed, if we were to have a system of education extended to the whole population, and especially to the populous parts of the country, school boards would be found one of the most effective means of carrying out that object. He agreed with the opinion, so strongly expressed by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Ripon), that there ought not to be any feeling of antagonism between school boards and voluntary schools, but that they ought to work harmoniously together for the promotion of a common end. He believed that there were two things at the root of the objection to school boards—In the first place, they had been found much more costly than they ought or needed to be; but still a greater objection was the general feeling that under these school boards, according to the present state of the law, the children could not receive the religious instruction which they ought to receive, and which the parents generally desired. The country generally was in favour of the Act of 1870, with the exception of its inadequate provisions on the subject of religious instruction. In his judgment and conscience he entirely agreed with what had been said so eloquently by the most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) as to the feeling of the country on this subject. He had hoped that we might have had in this Bill a provision requiring that religious instruction should be given in all board schools; and when he expressed that opinion he distinctly and emphatically disclaimed the idea of speaking with any view to the exclusive interests of the Church of England—he was speaking in the interests of no particular Church; and the humble efforts he had made in former years to promote education justified him when he said that he was not speaking in the interest of any particular denomination. He spoke in the cause of Religion and Christianity. He was the last man who would urge any system which would violate the scruples of Nonconformists;—he had always taken a different line. But the Roman Catholics in Ireland had religious instruction in their schools; if their Lordships turned to the Presbyterians of Scotland, they would find there was religious instruction in their schools; and in England he ventured to say that the national system, whatever it might be, ought not to be one which excluded religion. They were indebted to a Member of the House of Commons for having moved for a Return of the religious instruction in the board schools. He doubted whether it was as generally known to the public as it was to their Lordships what the case was with the great School Board of London. The Lord President, in his opening speech, spoke in high terms, and very justly, of the School Board of London. Well, this Resolution was passed by that School Board—

> "That, in the schools provided by the Board, the Bible shall be read, and there shall be given such explanations and such instructions therefrom in the principles of morality and religion as are suited to the capacity of the children, provided always that in such explanations and instructions the provisions of the Act, the 7th and 14th, are strictly observed both in letter and spirit, and that no attempt be made in any such schools to attach the children to any denomination."

When the London School Board had passed such a Resolution, the Government might well have regarded it as a precedent in this Bill. On the other hand, the Birmingham school board, as he learnt by a letter from a clergyman there, banished all religious teaching from its schools—

> "No Board teacher was allowed either to read or to teach the Bible, and, in fact, as far as the Board teaching was concerned, the name of God must not be mentioned."

Some statistics prepared by the National Society showed the action of school boards upon the subject of religious education. Out of 284 school boards, 62, while permitting the reading of the Bible, did not allow any note or comment, 16 forbad the reading or explaining of the Bible, and 39 forbad all religious observance or instruction in connection with the ordinary work of the school, or by any member of the school staff. Surely, it was not seemly or right that, under the legislation of this country, it should be in the power of any handful of men, exercising a brief authority in any district, thus to exclude from the teaching of the rising generation that knowledge without which education was worth very little. It was satisfactory, however, that while 117 boards had thus neglected the teaching of religion, the remainder, 167 in number, had in various ways, as in the case of the London School Board, laid down by certain rules that religion should be taught. Here was a clear proof, by a numerical majority, that the country was in favour of religious teaching, and any Government which made a change in this respect would receive the general support of the country. The question became more important when they considered the rapid increase of board schools as compared with voluntary schools. He accepted this as a valuable Bill to the extent to which it went; but he deeply lamented the omission as to religious education, his belief being that if the Government had introduced clauses of a moderate character, providing that religion should be taught in all our board schools that decision would have been in general harmony with the opinion of the nation. This subject could not and would not rest where it was. The country would not be satisfied as long as it was in the power of any set of men to deny to the children of the humbler classes the benefits of religious education.

EARL FORTESCUE, as a consistent Liberal, saw no just reason for opposing the provision that a majority of the inhabitants should be able, if they wished, to get rid of a school board now that other means of compulsory education were provided by legislation. School boards had done, and were doing, a useful work, but he agreed that they were much more costly than they might be or ought to be; and great part of this cost arose from the system of election. He suggested, in 1870, that that system might be assimilated to the mode of electing Boards of Guardians—a system which worked so satisfactorily that in 1874 and 1875 only four cases of contested elections had required inquiring into by the Local Government Board during each year; and which had been declared to be cheap and economical by more than 400 school boards in their Memorial to the Lord President complaining of the immense cost of the present system of election. It should be remembered that a large majority of the ratepayers voted under the Poor Law system of sending a few clerks round to collect the votes of the many voters; while, in spite of all efforts to excite and stimulate the voters, comparatively few voters voted under the school-board system of obliging the many voters to go and get their votes recorded at the polling booth by the few clerks. One cause of the unpopularity of school boards was the great expense incurred by them in elections and for non-educational purposes. He objected to those provisions in the present Bill that broke down the distinction between pauperism and independence. He was referring to what he might call the gushing and sentimental clauses about paying the school fees of the children of poor parents without considering it as relief given to those parents; about founding scholarships for children of 10 years old—a sort of yearling races; and, above all, about feeding children at the public expense in day industrial schools. Such a system combined the different disadvantages of legal relief and of private charity, without the advantages of either. Such relief would be grudgingly given and thanklessly received. It was undesirable in itself, and very dangerous as a precedent. He wished, however, to bear his testimony to the value of the clauses which dealt with poor schools, and which in his judgment would not lead to the results anticipated by his noble Friend the late Foreign Secretary. In conclusion, the noble Earl expressed his gratitude to the Government for the tardy, but not too tardy, repeal of the 25th clause and the substitution of the Board of Guardians as the body for ascertaining the ability of parents and for paying the school fees for the children. He could claim consistency in taking that course, because he had protested against the system as originally proposed for imposing that duty on the school boards, which had no officers like the relieving officers of the Board of Guardians, both competent and available for inquiring into the circumstances of the parents.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY thanked the noble Duke for bringing in the Bill, which would be accepted as a fulfilment in part of the promise made by the Government to promote religious education.

LORD WAVENEY bore testimony from his own experience to the value which the provisions in the Bill relating to industrial schools were calculated to confer.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

POLLUTION OF RIVERS BILL—(No. 207.)

(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was very much the same measure which had passed the House last year, and was lost in the general confusion which usually attended the termination of the Session in the other House. It did not go quite so far as that measure, but it proposed to effect three objects—the exclusion of solid matter and of sewage from rivers as well as all new sources of pollution arising from manufactures and mines.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Act passed in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of Her most Excellent Majesty Queen Victoria, relating to the registration of Births and Deaths in Ireland—Was *presented* by The Earl of DONOUGHMORE; read 1ª. (No. 208.)

House adjourned at half-past Nine o'clock till To-morrow, Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 8*th August*, 1876.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report* — Standing Orders Revision [No. 404].

Public Bills — *Ordered—First Reading* — Corrupt Practices at Elections * [291].

Second Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *.

Committee—Report—Suez Canal (Shares) [189]; War Department and Post Office (Remuneration, &c.) * [206]; Appellate Jurisdiction [111]; Sheriff Courts (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) * [289]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artizans and Labourers Dwellings) (*re-comm.*) * [287]; Parochial Records * [283]; Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment * [211]; Legal Practitioners * [43].

Considered as amended—Crossed Cheques * [267]; Queen Anne's Bounty * [278].

Considered as amended — Third Reading—Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bilbrough, &c.) * [265], and *passed.*

Third Reading—Local Government Provisional Orders (Birmingham, &c.) * [261]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bath, &c.) * [264].

SPECIAL WIRES.—QUESTION.

Mr. M. BROOKS asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is a fact that the special telegraph wire from London to Dublin, rented by Government to the Dublin "Freeman's Journal," a leading Irish Liberal newspaper, is one which goes round by Liverpool, and is subject to interruption and delay, of which frequent complaint has been made; whether another newspaper in the same city has a "direct" special wire from London viâ Holyhead, which is not liable to such interruptions; whether any difference is made in the rental of these two wires; and, whether it is his intention to take means to secure equality of Government telegraphic facilities for all newspapers in the same district?

Lord JOHN MANNERS: In reply to the Question of the hon. Gentleman, I have to state that it is a fact that the special wire rented by *The Freeman's Journal* goes by way of Liverpool, and I am sorry to say that complaints have been made as to interruption and delay. It is also a fact that *The Irish Times* has a direct special wire from London to Dublin. Both wires are *viâ* Holyhead, and the rental of both wires is the same. *The Irish Times* rented its wire at the period of the transfer of the telegraphs to the State in 1870, and *The Freeman's Journal* only rented its wire since February 1872. It would be obviously unfair to deprive *The Irish Times* of the wire which it has had since 1870, and at present a direct wire cannot be spared for *The Freeman's Journal.* In fact, the hon. Gentleman will see that it is rather a case of first come first served.

Mr. M. BROOKS: As to the amount of rent?

Lord JOHN MANNERS: I have said that the rent is the same in both cases.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENTS IN IRELAND.—QUESTION.

Mr. M. BROOKS asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is the fact that the "Freeman's Journal," a leading newspaper of Ireland, is the only one of the five daily papers in Dublin to which Government advertisements are not sent; whether it is the only one of the five Dublin daily papers professing Liberal and Home Rule principles; and, whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House the official list of the Irish newspapers to which Government advertisements were sent when Her Majesty's Ministers entered office, with a statement of the changes which have since been made, and the reasons for each such change?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I think this Question would have been more properly addressed to the Secretary to the Treasury than to myself; but, as a matter of fact, I believe that *The Freeman's Journal* does not receive all the Government advertisements. It is really no part of my business to inform the hon. Member whether that journal is or is not the only daily paper in Dublin professing Liberal or Home Rule principles; though I did not know up to this time that those political epithets were synonymous. The terms of the hon. Member's Question seem to imply an idea that Government advertisements are to be regarded in the light of a subsidy to the Press, and that *The Freeman's Journal* ought not to be deprived of its participation in that advantage by the peculiar and apparently unpopular principles which it professes; but Government advertisements are inserted in newspapers in order to make those persons who may be likely to supply the Government wants acquainted with them. The different Departments advertise their wants in those papers which they think possess the most general circulation, not so much amongst the public at large as amongst the class by which their wants are likely to be supplied. I have no such official list as that alluded to in the last part of the Question; but I know that many newspapers in Ireland opposed to the present Government in political opinion receive advertisements from one Department or another of the Government. For instance, some advertisements sent out from the Chief Secretary's Office are inserted in *The Freeman's Journal*, and I have no doubt that the Secretary to the Treasury would be prepared to consider any arguments which the hon. Member may adduce with the view of showing that it would be for the public advantage that more advertisements should be inserted in that newspaper than now appear there.

CRIMINAL LAW — THE CONVICT CHRISTOS BAUMBOS.—QUESTION.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether, considering that the only evidence against the Greek, Christos Baumbos (now under sentence of death), was the evidence of those who had killed his companions, rightly or wrongly, and considering there are grave doubts entertained by many persons as to the guilt of the condemned man, and considering also that one jury had refused to find him guilty, it is his intention to recommend to the Crown any alteration of the sentence?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I cannot admit the accuracy of the statements contained in the hon. Member's Question, either as to the evidence against the condemned man, or as to the doubts said to be entertained as to his guilt. I believe one jury refused to find him guilty of murder because a single juryman, being adverse to capital punishment, stood out for a verdict of manslaughter. No memorial has been presented on the convict's behalf, nor has the Judge who tried the case made any recommendation to the Government with regard to it. It is my duty to add, that I am not aware of any circumstances that would justify me in advising the Lord Lieutenant to interfere with the sentence of the law.

NAVY—THE NAVAL RESERVE.

QUESTION.

MR. GOURLEY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he intends this autumn to place as many of the seamen of the Naval Reserve as he can collect on board coast defence or other ironclad ships, for the purpose of being exercised in sea-going manœuvres in place of the present harbour and skeleton drill; and, further, to inquire how many torpedo boats, if any, he intends placing at the principal seaports of the United Kingdom for the purpose of instructing the men of the Coast Guard, Naval Reserve, and Coast Volunteers in the art of working them?

MR. HUNT, in reply, said, he had no power of placing Naval Reserve men on board sea-going ships, unless they volunteered for such service. It was not his intention to invite them this autumn so to volunteer, because the iron-clad ships in the Reserve had already been out for their annual cruise, and had completed it. With regard to the second Question, the defence of the commercial harbours was in the hands, not of the naval, but of the military authorities, and all the Admiralty had to do was to apply for the Votes necessary to enable them then to lay down torpedoes.

NAVY—RETIRED NAVAL COMMANDERS.—QUESTION.

MR. HANBURY-TRACY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, What conclusion he had arrived at respecting the Petition presented to the Admiralty by a large number of Commanders who have retired since the year 1870, praying that a step in rank may be granted to them, the privilege having already been conceded to Captains by Order in Council, 1870?

MR. HUNT: I have obtained an Order in Council to enable me to give effect to the prayer of the memorialists, and their names will appear in to-night's *Gazette.*

PUBLIC HEALTH—VACCINATION ACTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he has received a statement from Mr. and Mrs. Fry of Andover to the effect that their infant child died from the direct effects of vaccination on April 25th, after five weeks of dreadful suffering, the child having been previously healthy and free from any constitutional taint; whether he has received a report on this case from the Local Government Board Inspector; and, if so, whether it is the fact that in conducting his investigation, the Inspector did not visit the parents of the deceased child, nor examine the child from which the lymph was taken, and which is alleged to have "had a running sore in its arm, of a most offensive nature, for nine weeks;" and, whether in fact his report was founded merely on the cause of death as entered in the register?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, he had heard from Mr. and Mrs. Fry, but not until after Notice of the hon. Gentleman's Question had been given, and they in reply to an inquiry stated that they believed their child died from the direct effects of vaccination. They did not, however, give any particulars. This was one of four cases which had been brought under his notice by a letter from Mr. Pearce, of Andover, dated 6th of May last; and by his (Mr. Sclater-Booth's) directions a medical Inspector was sent down to make inquiry into the four cases reported to him. This was on the 25th of May. The general result of that inquiry had already been stated by him, in reply to a Question put to him by another hon. Gentleman—namely, that the cause of death was not in any of those cases attributable to vaccination. In reply to the second Question put to him by the hon. Gentleman, the Inspector, he might state, informed him that he did not, when making his inquiries, call upon Mr. and Mrs. Fry, because, as he had been informed, their child had then been one month dead, and because he had previously an opportunity of seeing the same child on the 7th of April, when he was making his usual tour of inspection. At that time the child appeared to him to be in excellent health, and the vaccination had been performed about 18 days. In reply to the third Question of the hon. Member, the Inspector informed him that he had not seen the cause of death on the register, but he understood from the medical attendant of the child that it died of bronchitis.

TREATY OF VIENNA, 1815—THE POLISH LANGUAGE.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been drawn to recent proceedings for the suppression of the use of the Polish language in the Civil and Criminal Courts of the Grand Duchy of Posen, contrary to the 2nd and 118th Articles of the Treaty of Vienna? To explain the Question, he said that Article 1 of the Treaty provided that "Polish subjects of Russia, Austria, and Prussia shall have such national institutions as are judged in accordance with the polity of each of three Powers." Article 2 recognized Posen as united to Prussia. Article 118 incorporated and confirmed a separate Treaty of the 3rd of May. By that Treaty Russia and Prussia assured such institutions to the Polish subjects of each as shall preserve their nationality; and the Proclamation of Frederick William III., dated Vienna, 15th May, 1815, declared to the inhabitants of the Grand Duchy, parted from that of Warsaw, and incorporated with the Kingdom of Prussia, that their language should be used concurrently with German in all public acts.

Mr. BOURKE: I do not know exactly to what my hon. Friend alludes, but conjecture that he refers to a debate which occurred in the Prussian Parliament in June last on the subject of the Official Language Bill. This debate called forth strong speeches from the Polish Deputies, and a *résumé* of the debate was sent to Her Majesty's Government in the usual way; but I fail to see in what way the 2nd and 118th Articles of the Treaty of Vienna affect the question, because the 2nd Article merely defines the limits of the Grand Duchy of Posen, and the 118th Article merely enumerates and confirms the various other Treaties which were made in 1815, and are declared part of the arrangements of the Congress. Neither of these Articles makes any allusion to the Polish language. It is true that by a Proclamation issued by the King of Prussia on the 15th of May, 1815, the inhabitants of the Grand Duchy of Posen were assured that their language would be used conjointly with the German in all public Acts; but the Proclamation was no part or parcel of the Treaty.

INDIA—THE KIRWEE BOOTY.

QUESTION.

GENERAL SHUTE asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If it is intended to refer the unadjusted prize claims of Sir George Whitlock's force as regards the Kirwee Booty to the High Court of Admiralty; and, whether more prompt steps cannot be taken to settle these claims?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, in reply, said, it was not intended to refer any question relating to the Kirwee booty to the High Court of Admiralty, or to reverse any decision that had already been arrived at; but the Secretary of State for India had communicated to the Indian Government his opinion that the account should be wound up, and any assets that remained distributed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

PLUMSTEAD AND WORMHOLT COMMONS.—RESOLUTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE rose to move, as an Amendment, that—

> "The action of the War Office with reference to Plumstead Common, in the county of Kent, and Wormholt Common, in the manor of Fulham, is such as to imperil the use of those open spaces for recreation by the people of the metropolis."

The hon. Baronet began by quoting as a precedent for the discussion even of general grievances on the Appropriation Bill, that of 7th August, 1875, when the hon. Member for Galway County (Mr. Mitchell Henry) had asked for the release of the Fenian prisoners. The grievance that he (Sir Charles Dilke) had to put before the House was of an urgent nature, and he had exhausted all other means of obtaining discussion upon it since it had been placed in his hands by his constituents—the jury of the Court Leet of the manor of Fulham. Moreover, this was a case properly to be discussed upon the Appropriation Bill, inasmuch as it concerned money Votes in the Estimates, for the War Office called on the nation to pay annual rent to the commoners of Fulham and to the Lord of Plumstead. The hon. Baronet then went on:—I confess I think that I have so strong a case that the Home Secretary, after all his declarations of this Session, ought to help me against the War Office. I say 'War Office,' and not 'Secretary of State for War,' because some of the steps taken in this matter were taken by the late Government, and have only been continued and extended by the Government now in office. It may be remembered that in 1874 I asked the Secretary of State for War, whether steps were being taken by the War Office of a nature calculated to limit the use of Wormholt Common, or Wormwood Scrubbs, by the commoners or by the public. He replied that the common in question had long been used by the troops for drill.

> "In order to secure the property it had been purchased, subject to the rights of the commoners. Negotiations were now going on with the commoners for the purpose of buying out their rights and giving them adequate compensation. There was no necessity at present to put in force the provisions of the Defence Act; but, if the commoners vexatiously interfered with the use of the place for drilling troops, it might be necessary to put those provisions in operation. As to the common being lost to the public, the object of the purchase was to keep it open."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxviii. 230.]

With regard to this last remark, why, if the War Office want to keep the common open, should they buy up and extinguish all rights in it except their own? Why not have these rights existing? Why convert the common into freehold property? With regard, too, to an earlier portion of the answer, what is this 'vexatious interference' which is expected from the commoners? Their position has been all along a very intelligible one. They have begged only to be let alone. I may add that I was astounded at the admission of the Secretary of State that the putting in force of the Defence Act against the commoners of the manor of Fulham had been contemplated for one instant. The Defence Act is purely an Act for the defence of the Realm against the King's enemies. The Preamble recites the finding of the Fortifications Commissioners in favour of the building of fresh forts. It cannot be for a moment contended by any man who reads it that Parliament meant the War Office to compulsorily acquire under the Defence Act lands for the drilling of troops. Yet the War Office has threatened, and still threatens, to take this monstrous step. The War Office purchased for the sum of £28,000, of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, their rights, as lords of the manor, over 140 acres of the common. Now, the lord of the manor of Fulham never had the right to break ground, and being prohibited from digging gravel, I venture to assert that the lord's rights were not worth purchasing, not worth one single penny. The sum of £28,000, paid for these rights by the War Office, has been thrown away! Not only thrown away! Worse than thrown away! The effect of a payment of this kind is to greatly raise the price of lords' rights in the case of all commons in the neighbourhood of London, and to force the Metropolitan Board, as representing the ratepayers of London, to pay unfair prices for the lords' rights in the case of all commons that they may wish, in the interest of the metropolis, to acquire. Wormholt Common is leased by the commoners to the War Office as a drill ground. It has long been much so used, without its use by the commoners' cattle and by the public being prevented. I really do not know why the Crown wants to acquire the freehold. The War Office, two years ago, offered a low price to the commoners for their rights. Now, the commoners do not want to sell at all, but if they are made to sell they want to get a proper price. This they ask, as I shall presently explain, not in their own interest, but in that of the poor. The present revenue from the common is between £400 and £500 a-year. Part of this is received from the War Office, under the lease to which I have just made allusion, £100 a-year comes from various Volunteer corps, £150 a-year is derived from the grazing rights, but this sum is not a real rent, and does not in the least represent the value of the rights, but something more like one-tenth only of the value. The grazing is a privilege of the commoners, and the sums received are only intended to check abuse and regulate the use of the privilege. If the grazing were to be let by the commoners to outsiders, not having rights of common, a vastly greater rent would be received. The commoners think that they have not only been harshly dealt with as to terms, but also as to the language in which the offers of the War Office have been made. After my Motion was placed upon the Paper the commoners were offered the sum of £10,000, and told that 'they need not expect one penny more,' as though their object was to extort money from the Crown. The commoners, I am entitled from my interviews with them to state, do not want the money. Their anxious wish is to be let alone in the exercise of their undoubted rights, and to spend their income in the future as they spend it now, not upon themselves, but upon the poor. But I look at this question not from the point of view of the commoners so much as from that of the metropolitan public. Pay the commoners what you will; I contend that you have acted most unwisely in paying £28,000 for the worthless rights of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and I would ask who advised the payment of that sum? Moreover, I ask, also, why do you wish to acquire the freehold at all, and what security have we that the common will not be built on. Your word? Yes; but how about your successors in 10 or 20 years? Nothing but the promise of a special Act of Parliament will suffice. Again, I hear that the commoners, frightened by your threats of putting the Defence Act in force, are withdrawing their opposition to a sale, taking less than their rights are worth. Who suffers? Not the commoners, but the Waste Lands Almshouse! Not the commoners, but the poor! I cannot see how the Almshouse, at present supported out of the revenues of the common, is to be kept alive. I have a list of the tenants of that Almshouse, from which I find that they are persons of exceedingly advanced age; indeed, there are 11 of them over 80, who, as far as I can see, will be turned into the streets if the commoners' rights are extinguished in this way. I come now to the equally shameful action of the War Office in the case of the east end common of Plumstead. This common and Bostall Heath contain together about 160 acres. Up to 1859, though troops were drilled there, the common was largely used for the purpose of recreation by the inhabitants of Woolwich, and used also by the commoners of the manor in the exercise of their rights of common. In 1859, Queen's College, Oxford, to which the manor belongs, began a high-handed course of action, with the view to crush the freeholders and build upon the common. In 1866 a suit was instituted in Chancery, at great cost, praying that the College might be restrained from inclosing. This suit was heard in 1870, when judgment was given against the College. That judgment was appealed against, and was confirmed by the Lord Chancellor in 1871. On this latter occasion the Lord Chancellor concluded his decision with the following memorable words:—

> "The inquiry has been occasioned by a high-handed assertion on the part of the College, who seem simply to have said to those who have been exercising their rights for 200 years, 'You will be in a difficulty to prove that you have exercised them, so we will put you to that proof by taking possession of your property.' Now, that is what it really is when you come to an inclosure done against those who have so long exercised the right to which I am thankful to be able to afford a legal origin."

After this happy decision we really thought that our money had not been spent in vain. Nothing took place until the end of 1873, when it was proposed to prepare a scheme for the management of the common in the interest of the inhabitants of the metropolis. It was then suddenly discovered that there was a lease, just made, from Queen's College to the War Office. We were forced to abandon our scheme. But what is the value of this lease? Who advised it? Queen's College could lease only what it had. What rights has it to lease to the War Office that can be worth to the War Office between £300 and £400 a-year rent? On the other hand, what of the poor commoners? What compensation have they received for their rights established at great cost in the suit? What of the unfortunate public? The common was always used for military drill, but since 1873 it has been cut to pieces and the turf entirely destroyed by artillery. It is now a very fair copy of the African Sahara. Had Queen's College the right as against the commoners to cut the turf to pieces by the use of artillery? Why, an injunction would have stopped such a course at once if it had been tried. But last week, when an injunction against the War Office was applied for, the Judge said—"Even if the Crown could commit a trespass, a subject could not sue for it." Is that Star Chamber doctrine still good law? May the artillery come and knock my private garden to pieces, and I be without the ordinary remedies of law? The whole of the advantages gained by the freeholders of the manor at a very heavy cost by the Chancery suit have been lost by the action of the War Office. Now, two years ago I asked the Secretary of State for War under what title the artillery cut to pieces the common. He replied that—

> "The artillery enjoyed the same right to practice on Plumstead Common which had been enjoyed since 1745."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxi. 1145.]

Now, I venture to put this question to the right hon. Gentleman. If he rests his right on prescription, why does he pay between £300 and £400 a-year to Queen's College for a lease? If he rests it on the lease of 1873, why did he talk to me about 'the same right which had been enjoyed since 1745?' He might as well have said 'since the flood.' If it is a Parliamentary expression—no more disingenuous answer was ever made. I do not accuse the right hon. Gentleman himself of the offence. It was a clerk who wrote the reply for him, of course. I remember—it was before I was in the House, but I have read of it—when a Secretary of State for War rose in his place to give an answer to a Question about an escort. He read from the clerk's paper in his hand—'The escort consisted of 20 rank and file;' 'that is,' he added, 'of 40 men.' No doubt it is better for Ministers to avoid the errors and to say what they are told to say by clerks; but, in this case, the reply which I received was not a proper one. I am told that, since my Motion has been placed upon the Paper, the War Office has proposed a compromise. I shall be glad to hear what the details of the compromise may be. In that which I have heard talked of, the cloven foot again appears. It is suggested that the War Office should give up half the common, but acquire, by means of the Defence Act, the whole of the rights over the rest. This is a fatal policy which we cannot possibly allow in the case of any common, without taking steps to test the right of the War Office to put the Defence Act in force for purposes of this kind. I can only warn the Secretary of State that in acquiring any property of the kind he should acquire it by a special Act of Parliament, rather than by straining the Defence Act to include cases which it never was meant to meet.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the action of the War Office with reference to Plumstead Common, in the county of Kent, and Wormholt Common, in the manor of Fulham, is such as to imperil the use of those open spaces for recreation by the people of the metropolis,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. BOORD wished to say a very few words in support of the Amendment. He complimented the hon. Baronet on the very lucid statement he had laid before the House, and also on the ingenious method he had chosen to escape from an embarrassing situation. He had succeeded in showing that the late Government were greatly to blame in this matter, and to make their fault appear less he had attempted to throw a still greater responsibility on the present occupants of the Treasury Bench. However that might be, the fact remained that by Lord Chancellor Hatherley's decision it was evident that there were commoners, and that those commoners had, and exercised, rights of the usual description. But how were they situated now? It was impossible for them to use their rights in consequence of the action of the War Department. The condition of the common had been correctly described by the hon. Baronet as that of a desert. But behind the commoners there was a still more important body—the public—which was represented in that locality chiefly by the operatives employed in the Royal Arsenal. He (Mr. Boord) would not contend for one moment that the public as such had any clearly defined legal right of user of the common; but the desirability of preserving open spaces for public recreation being universally admitted, it was convenient to regard the rights of the commoners as a means to that end. An arrangement had been proposed by an able member of the Woolwich Local Board (Mr. Lloyd), and he trusted that it would receive due consideration at the hands of the Secretary of State for War. He would not occupy the time of the House by following the hon. Baronet through the details of his argument, but would simply appeal to his right hon. Friend to consider this matter fairly, and see if some arrangement could not be made whereby those who toiled in the arsenal might have the opportunity for the recreation they so much needed.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, the hon. Member for Chelsea had taken a somewhat unusual course upon this question, because he had asked the House to come to a conclusion on the subject without placing any documentary evidence before them, and his Motion, if passed, would practically be a Vote of Censure not only on the present, but also on the past Government. He believed, however, that the hon. Baronet did not intend to press his Motion to a division, and that his real object was merely to elicit information on the subject, which he should be very happy to give him. The hon. Baronet had said that he (Mr. Hardy) had given a disingenuous answer when he spoke of the common having been used by the Artillery since the year 1740. Well, in reply to that, he could only say that he did not think that the Crown was bound any more than a private individual to disclose the nature of its title, especially at a time when other persons were seeking to set its rights aside, and that in this respect it was entitled to an equal protection of the law with a private owner. He would only make a few remarks as to the course taken with respect to these commons. With regard to Plumstead Common the facts stood thus:—Since 1740 the Crown had, without leave or licence from any person, used the common for practising the evolutions of artillery. His predecessor in office (Lord Cardwell) thought, however, it would be better to become possessed of the rights of the lords of the manor, so as to relieve himself from any opposition on their part. He (Mr. Hardy) quite admitted that the commoners also had rights over the common, and he would go further, and concede that the population of Greenwich had acquired certain rights of recreation in regard to it which ought to be respected. Negotiations, however, were now going on which he trusted would result in a satisfactory solution for all parties of the difficulty that had arisen; but he did not think that it would be prudent or desirable to state the stage those negotiations had reached to the House at the present moment. With respect to the rights of the Crown, the Master of the Rolls had most emphatically said it was impossible to get an injunction against the Crown, because it was itself the Fountain of Justice. No doubt the surface of the common was cut up to a greater extent by the heavy artillery, which required 8 or 12 horses to each gun, than it had been by the light artillery of former years; but that was a matter that could not be helped. It was in 1873 that his predecessor had obtained a lease, and certainly up to that time no complaint had been made by the commoners as to the use of the common. But since then not only private individuals, but the local board of Woolwich, had been anxious to come to some terms with the Government. He desired that facilities should be given for the recreation of the people; but holding the office he did he had also to look to the military requirements of the country, and he was not prepared to give up the rights which the Government had exercised unless it could be shown that he was entirely in the wrong. He declined to go into the question of the negotiations that were going on. He did not at all despair of making arrangements which would be satisfactory at once to the locality and to the Government. The Defence Act had not been put into operation with regard either to Plumstead Common or Wormwood Scrubbs; and if any question arose as to the force of that statute it would have to be determined, not by that House, but by the ordinary Courts of Law. With regard to Wormwood Scrubbs, Lord Cardwell had purchased the rights of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, as lords of the common, for the Crown, which he had paid for out of the £3,500,000 voted by Parliament under the Localization Act. If an invasion of this country ever occurred Wormwood Scrubbs might become of great importance for the erection of fortifications, and his predecessor had purchased the freehold of 54½ acres of land adjoining the Scrubbs at a cost of £24,600, in order to secure a large space for the exercise of the Cavalry, and which might ultimately be thrown open for public recreation. There was no intention to interfere with the rights of the commoners or of the public over the Scrubbs, and indeed the former received a rent from the Government for the use that was made of it, which circumstance was a sufficient proof that no confiscation of their rights was intended. He wished to point out, however, that some scheme with regard to these open spaces should be adopted which would render the public use of them more advantageous and less obnoxious to the neighbourhood than was at present the case. He trusted the House would leave the whole matter in the hands of the Executive. It would be impossible for it to come to any satisfactory conclusion on the Resolution of the hon. Baronet.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he did not think it necessary to discuss this matter in a hostile spirit. The ground of complaint with respect to Plumstead Common was not so much the use of the common by the troops as its abuse. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the War Office had a right arising from long use to that common for military purposes. [Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: The Crown.] Well, the Crown. He should be glad to know if that right rested upon any better ground than the right of the public to use the common. He was afraid that it had no other basis. All that the hon. Member for Chelsea had asked of the Government was that further proceedings should not be taken in the matter until it was submitted to the decision of Parliament. The excessive use of the common had really rendered it totally unsuitable for the purpose of public recreation; and he had a memorial from people living in the neighbourhood to that effect. The public considered that the War Office was not the best authority to define the right of use of the commons as between that Department and the public. The observations of the hon. Member for Chelsea had pointed to a scheme for the regulation of these commons under the Metropolitan Commons Act, and the suggestion was deserving of the attention of the Government.

MR. FAWCETT said, he believed his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea would be satisfied if the Government would give an assurance that the rights of the commoners would not be purchased until Parliament had considered the matter. If the Government would give that promise, and subsequently introduce a scheme of regulation, he believed that the object in view would be sufficiently met.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he had not the least objection to say this much — that he would conclude no arrangements before the beginning of next Session, so that there might be information before the House on the subject.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

SUEZ CANAL SHARES BILL—[BILL 189.]

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. LOWE said, that before they went to that stage he thought the House would like to have some little information as to the state of the undertaking. He thought the thing might be said to have settled down, so far as the outside public were concerned, and to have assumed its normal condition. Most of the things had happened which they had expected. The money and the interest on the money at the exorbitant rate agreed on had been paid—all that was done with. Then they had obtained three votes on the Council of the Board of Directors. The Council had been increased to 24 from 21, and three of these places had been given to gentlemen who represented the Government. They had not obtained, so far as he was aware, the recognition of any votes at all in the General Assembly of the Company. He should be glad to know if that was correct? He should also like very much to know whether their Directors would be admitted to the General Assembly of the Company as well as to the Council? All these things it was very desirable should be known. The Khedive had pledged himself for the interest on the large sum advanced; but in this matter they had to rely on a Power which had declared itself unable to fulfil its pecuniary engagements, and he should, therefore, like to know whether there was any special agreement that we should be paid, at all events, or whether we should have to take our chance with the rest of his creditors; and whether in that case we should exercise any influence with the Khedive that we should be paid in full, when so many were not paid in full, or not paid at all? It would be very interesting to know all these things. He should further like to know, whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer contemplated doing, what was often done in bankruptcy—namely, capitalizing the whole matter, and taking a dividend upon that? He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not take any particular amount of credit to himself or the Government for the fact that he had obtained three directorships in the Company; because, as was shown on the former debate when the Papers were laid on the Table, M. de Lesseps had been always ready—as early as 1871—to admit three Directors into the Council. M. de Lesseps was extremely frank upon the subject, because he said that would be the very way to preserve the Company under French influence. It would give the appearance but not the reality of power. Therefore, he did not expect much to be made of it. Then there was another point—the settlement of the question of the surtax—and he did not think that we could claim any great diplomatic victory in that matter either, because it had been shown by M. Lesseps that we did not gain by it anything more than he chose to give us. He trusted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in giving an account of the state of this undertaking, would steer clear of vague generalities, and that we should be paid no more with wind for our money. On former occasions when they asked what they had gained by this purchase, they had been told that it had strengthened the position of the Empire; and, if that statement were to be repeated, he should desire that the logical connection between the purchase and that result should be stated. They had been told that they had interests in the Mediterranean which they must and would preserve at all hazards; but how would the purchase of these shares enable us to preserve them? They were told that the great highway of India must be kept open. That was perfectly right; but how would the flinging of £4,000,000 into the lap of the Khedive, on which we should probably receive no interest for 19 years, help us to keep that highway open? Now that the first blush of the thing was over, and the glory had got rather stale, the Government might reasonably be asked to state how the matter really stood, and what real advantage we had gained by the purchase of these shares which we should not have had if we had not purchased these shares at all. He thought the House ought not to separate before hearing from the Government what good we were to get out of the enormous expenditure which we had made in this matter.

MR. GOURLEY was anxious to know precisely the meaning and object of the purchase of these shares. At the time when the purchase was made the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a speech at Manchester, said there were considerations in the present case which took the transaction out of the region of our financial policy, and that it was not to be drawn into a precedent. He should like to know from the Chancellor of the Exchequer what those considerations were? So far as he was himself able to judge, the purchase of a portion of the Canal would leave this country in a much worse position than if we had not possessed any shares at all; because, in the event of any complications with foreign Governments, those Governments would naturally seek to have the right to navigate the Canal by vessels of war equally with ourselves, and we should not be able to prevent them, except by keeping a fleet of ships on the spot for the purpose, which might prove very inconvenient. He believed that Her Majesty's Government entered into this transaction without really knowing what the object was. What we ought to have done, if anything at all, was to have purchased the whole Canal, so as to obtain entire control over it, and in that event the Government would have received the support of the country. As it was, we were only in the position of ordinary shareholders. It was to be hoped we should some day acquire the whole property.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, we had reserved the right to interfere whenever the interests of the Canal were at stake, inasmuch as we were proprietors of half the Canal, and that should be the first step towards redeeming the whole by a process similar to that by which the Sound Dues were redeemed. It was necessary to do something to enable us to lower the charges, which were very high, and often amounted to one-third of a ship's freight. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer seriously to consider the Treasury Minute, which was published on the 17th of July, with regard to the three directors by whom this country was to be represented on the Canal Company's Board, because that Minute was likely to raise very serious legal questions in France. Even although its terms were accepted by the Council of the Company, he did not think that it would hold good against third parties. The statutes of the Company laid down that each director must be the actual proprietor of 100 shares. Consequently, the Government said in that Minute that it had become necessary to provide each of those gentlemen with that number of shares; but he believed that the way in which that had been done would not give them the requisite qualification. If those shares had the coupons detached, they were clearly not qualfying shares; and although our directors were registered holders of shares, they were bound to give the profits to the Government, which gave them a fixed stipend, to include both their profits and their pay as directors. Therefore, they had no interest in promoting the future success of the Company. The Minute also directed an instrument to be executed by their nominees to the Council, binding them to return their shares to the Treasury in the event of their bankruptcy. But if these gentlemen were proprietors of shares, and yet returned a portion of their assets in case of bankruptcy, that bankruptcy would assume a very remarkable character. But in such a contingency which, of course, he did not anticipate, the French law would sequestrate these shares. It seemed to him that the arrangement was one which would lower the dignity of our representatives on the Board of Directors, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would re-consider the Minute in question.

Mr. E. J. REED said, that most of the disadvantages attending the purchase has resulted from Parliamentary and public discussion. However much we might injure our own position, we could not lose the advantage we had acquired by the purchase. It was not to be expected that Ministers should say in so many words what a private Member like himself might say; but there was no reason why he should not say that, in certain contingencies, the property must be taken possession of by the fleets of this country, and no one could doubt that part ownership would strengthen our position in holding it. That purchase had given us the *status* and a moral justification to interfere which we did not before possess. Great questions frequently arose upon which it was necessary to take public action, but in regard to which the Government could not discuss all the causes and all the "ins and outs" of the subject. That was the case at present; but what the Government had done would enable us with more justice, reason, and authority to assume a practical control over the Suez Canal when the emergency arose.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he could not regard the possession of the Suez Canal shares as necessary or advantageous. The holding of the shares would not alone keep open our route to our Indian Empire. The share certificates would not prevent a hostile fleet from closing the passage of the Canal in the event of an European complication; in one way only could that route be kept open, and that was by having a more powerful fleet than any that could be brought against us. Our fleet being swept away, what power was there in these £4,000,000 of worthless paper? Surely his hon. Friend the Member for Pembroke (Mr. E. J. Reed) did not suppose that the destinies of European nations could be determined by means of scraps of paper? No justification for the action which Government had taken could be based upon ground such as that. Then what security did the shares offer for the route to India, seeing that with or without the possession of the shares still the only safeguard was a powerful fleet? Looking at the transaction from a business point of view he would like to ask the Government whether they had conducted the purchase in a business-like manner. In the first place, why was the transaction entered into at all? That was a question the importance of which demanded a fuller discussion than it had received, and the opportunity for that discussion should have been provided at an earlier part of the Session. The Bill before the House was first mentioned some months ago, and it was brought in by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer some time back, and now when the House was weary, when there was but a thin attendance of Members, and those anxious to get away, they were called upon to discuss this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) had challenged the Government to lay before the House the reasons which induced such a large expenditure of public money; he (Mr. Rylands) would not venture to attempt to add force to that appeal, for he felt sure that it would receive the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He would content himself with taking lower ground, and looking at it merely as a business transaction he asked why did the Government purchase an article for £4,000,000 with a guarantee of 5 per cent when that same article could have been bought in Paris for £3,800,000, with a guarantee of 10 or 12 per cent? Unless in the reports which had reached him the truth was grossly misrepresented, £1,500,000 had been considered the full market value of the shares. Such was the statement which appeared in *The Times* newspaper, and he had seen no contradiction. But it was asked what guarantee was there that the Khedive would pay the 10 or 12 per cent when it was known, that he was actually borrowing money for which he was paying 20 and 25 per cent, and people were not disposed to lend the Khedive money at any price. But that consideration applied equally to the guarantee of 5 per cent, and there was no reason why Government should buy the shares upon higher terms than they were offered at. Her Majesty's Government, however, met the Khedive with most unusual generosity; they thought they ought to deal with him handsomely, that it was a great international undertaking, and that the Khedive could not be treated in an ordinary business manner. There was an elevation of sentiment about this; but, still, he (Mr. Rylands) failed to see in it a justification for giving for the shares a price beyond what any other capitalist would have offered. The Government were led to suppose that other parties were negotiating for the purchase of the shares; but he was inclined to believe that the English Government were imposed upon in these operations. Then after paying £4,000,000 we were absolutely unable to qualify our directors upon the company, and to get out of this absurd position when three directors were appointed we were obliged to purchase shares for £8,000 more. And so it came to this—that our commercial interest upon the Board was represented by £8,000 worth of shares, and upon the power of that sum our representatives depended! Whether we were right in the question of the qualification or whether we were wrong he was not prepared to say. One question he would like to put, and that was, whether steps had been taken to secure compensation to Sir Daniel Lange, who lost the position he held with the Company owing to the action of the Government in publishing a private letter sent by him. That gentleman was closely connected with the progress of that great work, and he endeavoured to serve his country. Some satisfaction was due to him from the Government of this country, whose inconsiderate conduct had led to his dismissal. Turning to another matter he expressed his strong disapprobation of the way in which the salary of Mr. Rivers Wilson had been increased in consequence of his having been made a director. If the duties of his office were not sufficient to occupy his attention then let other work be provided for him; but he objected to his holding two positions with two salaries. The action taken by Her Majesty's Government in effecting the purchase of the Suez Canal shares had led to serious pecuniary losses being suffered by many persons owing to the state into which the market for Egyptian securities was thrown by the transaction, and much distress and privation had followed. A week before the Suez Canal purchase, Egyptian Stock stood at 54, and it gradually went up to 60, then a large purchase was made at 61—the price next day was 64, and the day after the announcement appeared in *The Times* of the Suez purchase, and the Stock went up to 74. Some parties, who were in the secret, had made large amounts by their transactions. After a time a reaction occurred, and the Stock fell. What did the Government do then? They commissioned a most important member of their own body to proceed to Egypt under circumstances which led people to believe that the fact foreshadowed a great policy—namely, the taking of Egypt by the hand by the Government of England. Then, again, Egyptian Stocks went up, and people held the bonds with some confidence. What happened then? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreham (Mr. Stephen Cave) sent in a Report, and Egyptian Stock was very firm and rising; but the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government stated that the Report must not be published; and then what happened? Down went Egyptian Stock; and so it remained for some time. But on a certain Friday morning there were large orders for the purchase of the Stock from France. No one understood what it meant. The day passed. All the Stock that could be procured was purchased, and the Stock Exchange closed; but in the House of Commons, about half-past 1 o'clock on Saturday morning, the Chancellor of the Exchequer got up in his place and said that they had received intelligence by telegraph that the Khedive assented to the Report of the right hon. Gentleman. What happened then? Why, the following morning up went the Stock. So that there were people who on Friday knew about the telegram, and that the announcement would be made, and the result was that those people in France or Egypt operated in the Stock, and they again made a large plunder; but when the Report came out and was found not to justify the expectations it had given rise to, down went the Stock again. In the same way, Mr. Rivers Wilson was allowed to proceed to Egypt, and that fact enabled the Stock-jobbers to operate, and the Stock again went up and down. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London said that the

Egyptian policy of the Government was a drama in four acts; but it differed from all other dramas in this—that the grand letting off of fireworks and the transformation scene came first, and now it was ending in a good deal of gloom and disappointment. He did not know how the Government could justify what had been done in the matter. Their policy was, he believed, in any case an unfortunate policy, and might lead to an involvment of this country in Egyptian affairs in a very serious manner. He believed that finally the purchase would not be of importance to this country, while the way in which the negotiations were carried on was a source of great loss to our countrymen. He felt sure that it would come to be looked upon as one of the greatest mistakes the Government had made.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he should gladly have waited until any other hon. Members who desired to address the House had done so, but the statement just made by the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) was of so very serious a character, if he understood it rightly, that he was bound at once to ask an explanation of it, and at the same time to complain, as he did most seriously, that the hon. Member, if he had anything of the sort to say, had not mentioned it long ago, or given him notice of his intention to say what he had said. What he understood the hon. Gentleman to say was this—that upon the morning of a certain day, on the evening of which he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) read a telegram to the House stating that the Khedive had authorized the publication of the Report of his right hon. Friend the Member for Shoreham (Mr. Cave), orders were sent for the purchase of Egyptian Stock from parties abroad with the knowledge that he was in receipt of that telegram, and was going to communicate it to the House.

MR. RYLANDS: Oh, I beg your pardon.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I certainly so understood the hon. Member.

MR. RYLANDS: I am quite sure the right hon. Gentleman will believe me when I say I meant to cast no personal imputation whatever upon him. It was the last thing that would come into my mind. I believe fully in the high honour of the right hon. Gentleman. What I stated was that some people knew that the telegram was going to be sent, and allowed it to be known, and on their own knowledge took means of operating on the market. They must have known in Cairo, or France, or elsewhere in the morning that it was to be sent in the evening.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER was anxious that the matter should be made perfectly clear, because in the way the words of the hon. Member were used they involved a serious charge against himself. [MR. RYLANDS: "Oh, no, no!" Several hon. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear!"] He accepted, of course, the disclaimer of the hon. Gentleman, and he felt sure that every one would feel that it was impossible that such a thing could have occurred. He at once and frankly acknowledged that it was to him and his Colleagues matter of most serious anxiety, and had occasioned them the greatest regret, that, in consequence of the transactions that had been going on, there had been from time to time speculations on the Stock Exchange, and that, as they were informed, considerable sums of money had been won and lost on this matter. He hardly knew what one could say on such a matter. This, however, he confidently said, on the part of the Government—that no private information had ever been given or made use of, to the best of their belief, on the subject; and he earnestly entreated that, if there was any suspicion of that kind in any quarter, full inquiry might be made, so that, even at this late period of the Session, steps might be taken to ascertain that there was no foundation whatever for any imputation of that kind. He could believe that among all those different transactions some persons might have obtained some information, and there might have been reason to suppose this, that, or the other, and that some speculations that were very good and some that were very bad might have been made; but he wished to state the facts exactly as they occurred with respect to the publication or non-publication of his right hon. Friend's Report. When that Report was handed to them by his right hon. Friend, they communicated with the Khedive and informed him that they proposed to publish it. Well, the Khedive objected, in the telegram which would be found among the

Papers. His right hon. Friend at the head of the Government, in answer to a Question put soon after the receipt of the telegram, gave the answer that had been commented upon, and that answer, unfortunately, was misunderstood. His right hon. Friend intended to have said that the Khedive objected to the publication of the Report, not permanently, but in consequence of the then unsettled question of the financial relations of Egypt. His right hon. Friend adverted to what was in his mind at the time the communications were going on between this Government and the Khedive as to the appointment of a Commissioner from England, but it was understood by the public in another sense, and, unfortunately, that misunderstanding gave a blow to Egyptian credit which they very much regretted for the sake of the Khedive. The consequence was that his noble Friend (the Earl of Derby) sent a telegram to the Khedive informing him that the non-publication of the Report was injurious to his credit. The Khedive thereupon sent a telegram to say that he was ready to agree to the Report being published. That telegram was received at the Foreign Office late at night, not earlier than between 11 or 12 o'clock. His right hon. Friend at the head of the Government was absent, the business was going on, and he thought he could not do better than, at the earliest moment he could, read the telegram to the House. What was done was done in the regular course of official business, and it had been matter of extreme pain and regret to the Government that any person should have been injuriously affected. As to what communication might have been going on between the Khedive and persons at Cairo or elsewhere he knew nothing; but of this he could entirely assure the House—that if the shadow of a doubt existed in the mind of any hon. Member, or if any hon. Member was aware that among any class in the country any impression or suspicion existed that there was anything in the matter, so far as Her Majesty's Government was concerned, that ought to be inquired into, he implored them, he adjured them in the name of the honour of the Government and of the House, not to allow the matter to rest, but to bring it at once into a condition in which it could be fully inquired into. He would now endeavour to answer the different points which had been mooted in the course of the debate. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) asked what was their precise position with regard to this undertaking? Well, they had waited until the general meeting of the Company, which was to have been held in June, but was not held till July, in order to ascertain the arrangements the Company were prepared to recommend. The managing body recommended—M. de Lesseps especially—the increase of the number of directors to 24, and agreed that the new directors should be nominated by the British Government. The understanding was that they must be duly qualified and elected in the manner described by the statutes of the Company. M. de Lesseps gave the Government to understand that it was presumed they would not nominate persons who would be offensive on any grounds to the shareholders, but that if any such person was nominated it should, on the fact becoming known, be in the power of the English Government to name his successor. It was the impression of Her Majesty's Government that their duty was to nominate persons who should represent the interest, amounting to the value of 176,000 shares, which the Government had in the Canal; but M. de Lesseps pointed out that there still was a question, which had never been decided, as to the precise amount of right which these shares during the time their coupons were detached from them gave to the shareholders. It was competent for the British Government to have brought that question before a French Law Court for decision; but they thought that, looking to the whole spirit of the arrangement, and their desire to enter into this matter on the fullest terms of confidence and goodwill with the Company, it was not desirable to raise contentious questions, and that it would be better that they should see that the directors were qualified in accordance with the statutes of the Company. They did not abandon their claim to vote on account of their own shares, but they thought that the simplest way would be to purchase a certain number of qualifying shares, and place them in the hands of the gentlemen who might be the representatives of Her Majesty's Government on the Council. This view was communicated to M. de Lesseps, and was considered by the legal advisers engaged on both sides of the question, the result being, as far as Her Majesty's Government was concerned, a conviction that the course taken opened no legal difficulties as far as the final settlement of the question was concerned. If, however, it should appear hereafter that legal difficulties really existed, the step taken was one that could be retraced when occasion arose. These gentlemen did not go there to represent their own interests, they went there to represent the interests of the country which nominated them; and the Government were convinced, from their knowledge of the character and ability of these gentlemen, that they would represent effectively the interests of this country. It had been suggested that the mode in which they were appointed, or nominated, was one which implied humiliation as far as they were personally concerned; and the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had gone the length of saying that one of them (Mr. Rivers Wilson) ought not, if appointed at all, to receive any payment for the duty additional to that which he at present received as a servant of the Government. The duties which Mr. Wilson at present discharged were highly important, but they did not occupy the whole of his time, nor was his salary by any means extravagant, and it was believed that he might very well give one day in a month to the Suez Canal business, with a small additional payment to recompense him for the work, and pay the expenses which he would have to incur. The question of the right of voting in meetings of the Company by the directors appointed by the English Government had been raised, and upon that question he could pronounce no authoritative decision; but in any case he thought the question was one of infinitesimal importance. The advantage which they had gained in respect of this matter was really that which was stated by the hon. Member for Pembroke (Mr. E. J. Reed)—namely, the moral position which they had acquired in dealing with these questions. The surtax arrangement was just one of the questions in point. Though the question was settled at Constantinople, yet it was settled subject to certain protests, and in a manner that always left you with the apprehension that the question might be re-opened, and re-opened in a very awkward manner. The Government should have insisted upon the matters that had been agreed to; but their object was to avoid the necessity of having to invoke the armed interference of the Khedive, or of the Turkish Government, or of our own Power. When hon. Gentlemen talked about keeping open the Canal by the power of our Fleet, of course we might; but the object was to avoid using force, and to put ourselves in a position where we would be able to deal with all these questions in a much more satisfactory manner. These were the general considerations which induced the Government to make the purchase, and nothing had occurred since to cause them to doubt their soundness. Colonel Stokes and Mr. Rivers Wilson had been in Paris, and had attended one of the meetings of the Council, and in their Report to him they stated that they had been received in the most amicable manner; that they had been treated with the fullest confidence and in a spirit which promised that the best possible relations would exist between us and the managers of this great Company; and that they had been very much struck with what they saw of the administration and the general management of the undertaking. Every person who had read the Company's last Report would have seen that, as far as prosperity was concerned, the undertaking was in a very flourishing condition, for at the present time, when commercial affairs were not particularly bright, it showed that the receipts of the Canal were going on in a most satisfactory manner, inasmuch as last year the excess of receipts over expenditure had increased by about 17 per cent over that of the previous year, while at the same time the expenses had scarcely been increased at all. The question of surtax was still in this position—that it was impossible for Her Majesty's Government to adopt M. de Lesseps' proposals merely as for this country, as it was necessary to obtain the concurrence of other countries which were interested in the matter. Communications had been going on with the different Governments which would shortly be laid before Parliament, and they were, so far as they had gone, generally in favour of the arrangement which had been come to, which showed to the shipping interest with certainty what the duties would be that they would have to pay year by year. The right hon. Gentleman had asked questions with reference to the probability of the Khedive continuing to pay the £200,000 per annum; but he thought that those were questions which the right hon. Gentleman, to a certain extent at least, was as qualified to answer as he was himself. It was a very hard matter to say whether or not at some time or another a difficulty might occur in the payment of the money, but his own belief was that the money would be paid. It was paid on the last occasion, and he saw no reason why it should not be paid in future. In conclusion, he could only acknowledge and regret the lateness of the period when this matter had been brought forward—it certainly ought to have been discussed at a much earlier period of the Session. Her Majesty's Government, however, were waiting for the action of the Company and for the meeting to which he had referred and which had explained to the House the manner in which the undertaking was being carried on. In consequence of the mode in which the Business of the House had been transacted it was impossible to get time earlier in the Session for the discussion of the subject. All he could say was that so far as the Government were concerned, the reasons which induced them to make this purchase stood good, that his faith had not been shaken by anything that had taken place, and though there might have been some exaggeration in the minds of the people at the time when the purchase was announced, his own belief was that in making that purchase they had arrived at a good and sound conclusion.

MR. RYLANDS disclaimed all intention of throwing imputations upon Her Majesty's Government in reference to this subject.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER thought that there was some ambiguity in the expressions which had been used by the hon. Member that rendered it imperative upon him to offer the explanations he had done of the conduct of the Government in the matter.

MR. MAC IVER heartily concurred in the remarks of the hon. Member for Pembroke (Mr. E. J. Reed). At first people were thoroughly pleased with what the Government had so well and boldly done. No doubt expectations were raised too high, but this was no fault of Her Majesty's Ministers. In the calm judgment of the mercantile constituency which he (Mr. Mac Iver) had the honour to represent the transaction was still approved, and in the port of Liverpool no sympathy was entertained for the carping objections that had been raised to this purchase by hon. Members opposite. The large trading communities took a broad view of the matter and did not regard it as a mere question of 5 per cent interest.

MR. NORWOOD said, he did not think that portion of the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer which referred to the moral advantages to be derived from the purchase was quite satisfactory, nor did he agree with the remarks of the hon. Member for Pembroke. The fact was simply this—that in case of a war it might be necessary and justifiable for England by force of arms to secure so important a channel of communication with the East as the Suez Canal; but he failed to see how the purchase of the shares gave the slightest additional power to the Government to adopt that course. As regarded the commercial aspect of the transaction, the shares having no coupons attached, we had no direct pecuniary interest in the good or bad management of the Canal at the present time, and any proposal on our part to reduce the rates or dues would be met by the obvious objection from the other shareholders, that while it would not affect the English Government, which had its five per cent guaranteed, it would seriously diminish their dividend. In his opinion, as far as our mercantile interests were concerned, we were in a better position before the purchase, as mere customers of the Canal, than we were when we acquired a number of shares which did not rank on an equality with the others. He hoped that the forebodings expressed in connection with the transaction would not be realized, but the action of our representatives on the Board of Directors would have to be watched very carefully. They might rely upon it that applications for money to keep the Canal in a proper state would soon be made, and the probability was that that money would have to be furnished by England. He sincerely trusted that the Government would instruct their representatives not to compromise the mercantile interests of the country by any premature action on their part.

Mr. GREGORY, in support of England's investment in the Suez Canal, considered it a sound one, politically and commercially considered. He could not admit that there was anything derogatory in the position of the English directors. Those gentlemen were placed on the direction to represent the Government, and a more honourable position he could not conceive. They were trustees of the English Government for the shares and acted on behalf of the Government in the management of this undertaking. They had declared themselves to be trustees in the same manner as was frequently done when family interests had to be represented in commercial undertakings; but they were present in the Direction, not as trustees, but as individuals perfectly free to act in the Direction, independent of any declaration of trust they had made. At the same time they represented a very powerful interest in this great partnership, and must exercise a preponderating influence over it. The possession of these shares to England was of great importance; and seeing that they might have got into adverse hands, he considered the arrangement made by Her Majesty's Government was one of great advantage to the country.

Mr. MUNTZ said, that sharing the general impression at the time of the purchase, he looked upon it as a bold stroke of policy which would place us in a better position in case of the occurrence of unforeseen difficulties. He had read the charter, and if the Company were to become bankrupt, the property in the Canal must fall into the hands of the French. This country had the guarantee of the Khedive, and, what was of far superior consideration, they had the guarantee of the Sultan; but, unfortunately, Turkey was in such a state at that moment that it was impossible to say how it would end. Looking at the matter from a commercial point of view, he agreed with the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood). First of all, we were told by the Government that it was not a commercial matter; then we were told by Lord Derby at Edinburgh that it was; next the Prime Minister spoke of it as a political transaction; and now, again, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was a commercial one. If it were a commercial transaction, what he had done would be like coming to the rescue of a firm in difficulties and engaging to renew its bills without any guarantee, for a more insolvent State than Egypt did not exist; and if we got back our money it would be through our claim having an admitted priority. We had no greater control that we had before, but the capital we had invested in the undertaking must give a corresponding weight to our influence. He was afraid that considerable expenditure would be requred to keep the Canal in such order that it would be available for our own shipping, and that we should be called upon to find capital for the purpose. It would be better if the Government acknowledged the truth at once, and owned that the purchase of the shares was a political transaction, entered into with the view of keeping open our ocean highway to the East.

Lord ELCHO said, it was natural the Opposition should criticize a transaction of this kind, but it was refreshing to see the hon. Member for Pembroke (Mr. E. J. Reed) cast aside the trammels of Party and treat this as a great national question. As such he believed it would be viewed by the constituencies, who, if appealed to, would throw the carping criticism of the Opposition to the winds, and give their verdict that politically the purchase was a bold and a wise act. Had the Government not availed themselves of their opportunity, and not purchased those shares, he had no doubt the Opposition would then have criticized their omission to secure for England the interest she was entitled to possess in so great an undertaking. England possessed the largest number of shares in the Canal, and her interests, politically and commercially, in it would no doubt be well represented by the three directors whom she had appointed to watch over and represent them. Government had, in fact, recovered the position for England which Lord Palmerston had lost.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Until my noble Friend addressed the House I was under the impression that Members of the Opposition had criticized the measure submitted to the House by the Government. The noble Lord appears to be of opinion that the discussion which has occurred is not criticism, but carping. I do not think it much matters whether he calls it criticism or carping. We criticize the measures of the Government in the best way we are able, and I can assure him we shall not be deterred from that duty by the epithet he chooses to apply to that humble criticism. Although it is to be regretted in one sense that this debate should have been brought on so late in the Session, it is not altogether unfortunate, because of the instructive comparison that might be drawn with respect to the treatment of this subject between the opening of the Session and its close. At the opening of the Session the transaction was almost in the first blush of its prosperity and popularity. And the minimizing explanation, although it had, I believe, to a certain extent set in already, had not attained the full vigour and strength that it has now at the close of the Session arrived at. It would be extremely instructive, if we had time to make a comparison between some of the speeches delivered at the commencement of the Session and the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer to-night. All traces of high policy have now vanished from the speeches of the Government; their high policy remains, in a feeble and diluted form, in the speeches of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire and my hon. Friend the Member for Pembroke (Mr. E. J. Reed). Nothing is now said about the high road to India and the chain of fortresses in which the Suez Canal was to form a link. This line has altogether vanished from the speeches of the Government, and we are told to look for the advantage of this transaction to the improved tone of M. de Lesseps. We are told that nothing can be more friendly than the communications betwen Colonel Stokes and M. de Lesseps. That is easy to be understood; but it may be doubted whether the improved tone of our correspondence is worth £4,000,000 of public money. The right hon. Gentleman can no doubt point to two results. He can point to the appointment of three directors on the Board, and he can point to the satisfactory and amicable arrangements come to between Colonel Stokes and M. de Lesseps on the surtax. He says M. de Lesseps made a great concession in the matter of the appointment of directors. But that is the very thing M. de Lesseps wanted us to do five years ago. In the negotiations in 1871 it was stated that M. de Lesseps "recoiled with horror" from the idea of the management of the Canal passing into the hands of a foreign Power. He declared he never would be a party for the placing of the management of the Canal in other than French hands, but he trusted to see the introduction of English directors on a French Board. At the same time, this was only to "give an appearance of importance without its actual possession." These being M. de Lesseps' views in 1871, no doubt M. de Lesseps did not see any reason to change them; but these being M. de Lesseps' views, I do not think it was necessary to spend £4,000,000 to get M. de Lesseps to agree to what he desired in 1871. The negotiations on the surtax are said to have gone on smoothly; and they may have ended in a satisfactory result; but that result has been brought about not by concessions on the part of M. de Lesseps, but on the part of Colonel Stokes and the English Government. The surtax was to have terminated at an earlier date than that now fixed upon, and it is not wonderful that M. de Lesseps and the French Direction should show a conciliatory spirit, when all the concessions were made, not on the other side, but on ours. It is quite unnecessary to say what will be the effect in time of war. I doubt whether it will have any effect in time of war. I cannot agree with the hon. Member for Pembroke that by the influence we have acquired through these shares in the Canal we should have acquired the right in time of war to seize upon the whole, and to disregard not only our own rights, but those of our co-partners. It may be my own fault, but I am unable to follow that argument of my hon. Friend. It would be the same as if we should acquire an interest in the railways of a neighbouring State, with which we at some time might be at war, in order that we might have a moral right to take possession of those railways in case of an invasion of the country. I do not believe that this purchase will have any effect upon the possession of the Canal in time of war. What must happen in time of war must be decided by contingencies. It is impossible to foresee what can only be decided upon at the moment. What the House wants to know is what will be the effect on certain ordinary creditors in the Canal in time of peace. Many Members of this House who are competent to give an opinion think our position is not improved by anything that has taken place, and that our interests are not so simple and well-defined as before. Up to the present year the Government was the representative of a nation which made use of the Canal to a vastly greater extent than any other European nation. It had certain rights secured to it under the concessions, and at all events occupied a definite and well-defined position as the representative of the greatest trading nation of the world. Now the Government is not merely the representative of the customers of the Canal—it has become a co-partner in managing the Canal, and a co-partner under very different circumstances from the other shareholders. In that way it seems to me that the position of the Government is particularly complicated, and I fail to see that it is in any way strengthened. It appears to me, on the contrary, that the Government will be somewhat shy in future in embarking in these commercial enterprizes, or in interfering in the pecuniary affairs of other nations. It was impossible for hon. Members not to sympathize with the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he spoke of the deep regret with which he had learnt of the Stock Exchange gambling transactions which had resulted from the action of the Government. The House was not surprised that the right hon. Gentleman should have so warmly as he did repudiated the suspicion that the Government was in any way a party to transactions of this character; but it showed how extremely inconvenient, and how much to be deprecated, it is that the Government should have taken any part whatever in transactions such as those to which I have referred, and that they should have to trust to the right hon. Gentleman to rise and repudiate any idea of such a thing. There is no doubt that clever and unscrupulous persons, apparently acting in Egypt or in other parts of the world, have made use of the knowledge they acquired of the intention of the Government in this country to act on the Stock Exchange in London, Paris, and other places in a manner not creditable to the British Government. I do not think we can be proud of the part which the Government of England played on the Stock Exchange in Europe; but I do think it will be a lesson to the Government to avoid for the future being mixed up in such transactions.

Mr. DISRAELI: Sir, there seems to be one fallacy that pervades all the remarks of hon. Members on the opposite side of the House on this subject, and that is the assumption on their part that our interest in an institution cannot be at the same time political and commercial. Take, for example, the National Debt. That is a political institution. It is so in a special degree, and never could have existed had it not been founded upon the most delicate of all political considerations—national credit. It depends upon political considerations. Its prosperity and its influence in the world depend upon political considerations. Yet I suppose hon. Gentlemen will hardly agree that it must not be considered a commercial institution, or the declaration of our dividends would not be met in due time with the same regularity and promptness as they are at present. For my own part, I never deviated—nor am I aware that my Colleagues ever deviated—from the declarations we made when we announced the purchase of these shares. We purchased them from high political considerations; and had it not been for those considerations we should never have entered into those negotiations. But having bought those shares, it became our duty to make every arrangement and take every precaution that the country should not be financially and commercially a loser. While, therefore, we thought we had accomplished a great political object, we were at the same time anxious to prevent the country from experiencing any loss. It seems to me the position is so clear that there cannot be any misapprehension that political and commercial principles can exist in the same institution, notwithstanding the unauthorized remarks of the noble Lord and others who preceded him. Nor do I think the noble Lord was particularly fortunate in his argument that M. de Lesseps, when he offered to consent to the appointment of three English directors some time ago, said that they would exercise no influence except as directors, if they were introduced into the Board on the part of the English proprietors. It is very true that in 1871 M. de Lesseps did make that remark, and insisted upon it. He said that the three English directors would be nothing more than three individuals who would exercise that influence which by their qualifications under the charter of the Company they might possess. But in 1871, when M. de Lesseps made that observation, England had not purchased half the shares in the Company. Therefore, all the arguments of the noble Lord based upon the remarks made by M. de Lesseps at that time go for nothing at all, and do not apply to the circumstances with which we have to deal at present. Nor is there anyone who can doubt the contrast between the two cases. Suppose that in 1871 English directors had been appointed in the manner referred to, and suppose that in the present case the English directors were appointed after the purchase of the Canal, is there any body of men either in this country or on any of those Stock Exchanges of Europe with which the noble Lord seems so familiar, who would hesitate to say which three individuals would exercise the greatest influence? Every man of sense must know that the three English directors now to be appointed would occupy a totally different position from the three individuals whose appointment in 1871 was suggested by M. de Lesseps. Then the noble Lord says my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer entirely disregarded all political considerations, and founded his observations on commercial considerations. My right hon. Friend very properly, on a Bill of this kind, made observations which he argued out completely, so far as financial and commercial considerations can go. To-night my right hon. Friend, as I listened to his arguments, never for a moment deviated from the political position which the Government assumed with regard to this question. He argued in this way. He said one of the great advantages of this is that we obtain our object in an amicable manner, which otherwise might be obtained only by painful controversy, and probably by force. What is that but a political consideration, and of the highest kind. What does that prove? That we obtain this object, not for financial and commercial considerations, though it is our duty not to neglect these financial and commercial considerations. but for our political considerations. Now, with regard to what the noble Lord says about the influence of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government on the Stock Exchanges of Europe, all I can say is I am innocent in the matter. I have never allowed considerations of what would happen on the Stock Exchanges of Europe to prevent me from doing that in public which I think would be for the advancement of the welfare of this country. If we were to be arrested in our conduct of the high matters which are involved in the government of a great country like England merely, by considerations of what the effect of our words would be upon the Stock Exchanges of Europe, I think we should be in a position which, as a public man, I should feel to be utterly disgraceful. Sir, I hope this Bill will pass without any opposition. I feel sure myself that the feeling of the country is not changed as to this great enterprize. I cannot doubt that the hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Mac Iver) spoke with justice when he expressed the opinion of the powerful community in which he lives. I believe that the people of the country have not changed one iota the sentiments which influenced them at the commencement of the Session; that they look upon this act on the part of Her Majesty's Government as a political and patriotic act; and as such, if ever the matter is made a subject of controversy, and I am before my countrymen, I shall be ready to appeal to them with the utmost confidence.

Mr. MONK said, he thought it only due to the Government to say that he, in common with many Members on that side of the House, did not concur with the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition in condemning the action of the Government in reference to the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, but he agreed with him in the regret he expressed that the purchase of the shares had led to so much speculation on the Stock Exchange. On that matter he, however, entirely acquitted Her Majesty's Government. He differed entirely from the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) in looking upon this transaction as a commercial one. It was undoubtedly a bold step for the Government to take. Unfortunately this country had been placed in a false position in respect to the Canal during the Ministry of Lord Palmerston. The country had never approved of that policy; and when the opportunity presented itself to the Government to acquire a permanent interest in that great work, he, for one, considered that they were perfectly justified in doing so. The country had accepted the purchase as evidence of a far-seeing policy on the part of the Government, and he believed it would meet the approval of a large majority of the House. He hoped they would give a unanimous vote in favour of this Bill.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, admitting that the Government were not to be influenced in their decision of important matters of State policy by consideration as to the effect that policy would have upon the Stock Exchanges of Europe, regretted that when the arrangement as to the purchase of the shares had been completed it had not been at once made known. It was admitted that immense speculation occurred in different Egyptian Stocks, not in consequence of knowledge acquired at this side, but of telegraphic communications from Alexandria, and these might have been prevented by immediate publication. It was, however, an unusual transaction, and the Government had no precedent to guide them; but, at the same time, he was strongly of opinion that operations of this kind ought to be at once made publicly known.

Mr. BATES said, that as a matter of fact the transaction was made known when it was completed.

Mr. SAMPSON LLOYD, in reference to the supposition that this country was opposed originally to the construction of the Suez Canal, observed that that was altogether a mistaken idea. Had the opinion of the commercial community been taken on the subject, they would by a large majority have declared in favour of the enterprize as a great political and patriotic transaction, to use the words of the Premier. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister of the day did not take that view, but the preponderance of opinion in the country was the other way.

Mr. Monk

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On Question, "That the Preamble be postponed,"

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reference to the observations of the hon. Member for Maidstone (Sir John Lubbock), to the effect that Her Majesty's Government ought to have made the purchase of the shares known the moment the transaction was completed, said that what occurred was this—On first receiving an intimation that the Khedive was willing to offer the shares on certain terms, Her Majesty's Government made an offer in return by telegram, and it was not until that offer was finally accepted that they were in a position to publish anything. But when they received notice that the Khedive accepted the offer, they made the fact known that same evening. As to Mr. Stanton, the third of the three directors whom they had a right to nominate, he had been selected by the Government as their representative upon the interior Committee of Management, which only consisted of five members, and would reside in Paris, because the business was carried on there, and not in Egypt.

Preamble *postponed.*

Clause 1 (Treasury to hold and use shares).

In reply to Sir H. Drummond Wolff,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the Bill would give power to the Treasury to act in such manner as might seem to be necessary for the interest of the public. He thought it unadvisable either to raise or discuss at the present time difficulties that might never arise.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

WAR DEPARTMENT POST OFFICE (REMUNERATION, &c.) BILL—[Bill 206.]

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Lord John Manners.*)

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on the War Department and Post Office (Remuneration, &c.) Bill).

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. MELLOR proposed that the House should go into Committee on the Bill on that day two months. He opposed the Bill because it would involve the Exchequer in an additional expense of £75,000 a-year. Of the persons concerned it was stated that 274 were merely learners.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Mellor,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. W. H. SMITH explained that no person who had been employed as a telegraph clerk by any of the telegraph companies would receive superannuation allowance under this Bill, which was intended to remedy an irregularity in the appointment of the other telegraph clerks which prevented their salaries being passed by the Public Accounts Committee. In consequence of the irregularity to which he referred there were now 3,600 persons in the Government service who were not entitled to be paid their salaries, and it would be a grievous injustice to them if the measure were rejected, inasmuch as they were no parties to the irregularity in question, and had taken their appointments on the faith that they were to receive superannuation allowances. The irregularity he referred to was these persons being appointed without having passed the necessary Civil Service examination, for which, however, another examination more suited to their offices had been substituted. Since the present Government had been in office these irregular appointments had ceased to be made. It was true that many of these persons had entered as learners, but they had subsequently become clerks.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL.

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

[*Lords.*]—[BILL 111.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL believed that the several clauses he now proposed in connection with this Bill had been carefully considered by hon. Members. One of them was in page 6, after line 5, to insert—

(Amendment of the Supreme Court of Judicature Acts in relation to Her Majesty's Court of Appeal.)

"Whereas it is expedient to amend the constitution of Her Majesty's Court of Appeal in manner hereinafter mentioned: Be it Enacted, That there shall be repealed so much of the fourth section of 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875,' as provides that the ordinary judges of Her Majesty's Court of Appeal (in this Act referred to as 'the Court of Appeal') shall not exceed three at any one time.

"In addition to the number of ordinary judges of the Court of Appeal authorised to be appointed by 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875,' Her Majesty may appoint three additional ordinary judges of that Court.

"The first three appointments of additional judges under this Act shall be made by such transfer to the Court of Appeal as is in this section mentioned of three judges of the High Court of Justice, and the vacancies so created in the High Court of Justice shall not be filled up, except in the event and to the extent hereinafter mentioned.

"Her Majesty may by writing, under her sign manual, either before or after the commencement of this Act, but so as not to take effect until the commencement thereof, transfer to the Court of Appeal from the following Divisions of the High Court of Justice, that is to say, the Queen's Bench Division, the Common Pleas Division, and the Exchequer Division, such of the judges of the said Divisions, not exceeding three in number, as to Her Majesty may seem meet, each of whom shall have been a judge of any one or more of such Divisions for not less than two years previously to his appointment, and shall not be an ex-officio judge of the Court of Appeal, and every judge so transferred shall be deemed an additional ordinary judge of the Court of Appeal in the same manner as if he had been appointed such judge by letters patent. No judge shall be so transferred without his own consent.

"Every additional ordinary judge of the said Court of Appeal appointed in pursuance of this Act shall be subject to the provisions of sections twenty-nine and thirty-seven of 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873,' and shall be under an obligation to go circuits and to act as Commissioner under commissions of assize or other commissions authorised to be issued in pursuance of the said Act, in the same manner in all respects as if he were a Judge of the High Court of Justice.

"There shall be paid to every additional ordinary judge appointed in pursuance of this Act, in addition to the salary which he would otherwise receive as an ordinary judge of the Court of Appeal, such sum on account of his expenses on circuit or under such commission as aforesaid, as may be approved by the Treasury upon the recommendation of the Lord Chancellor.

"Each of the judges of the High Court of Justice who is in pursuance of this Act transferred to the Court of Appeal, by writing under the sign manual of Her Majesty, shall retain such officers as are attached to his person as such judge, and are appointed and removeable by him at his pleasure, in pursuance of 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873,' and the officers so attached shall have the same rank, and hold their offices by the same tenure, and upon the same terms and conditions, and receive the same salaries, and if entitled to pensions be entitled to the same pensions, and shall as nearly as may be perform the same duties as if the judges to whom they are attached had not been transferred to the Court of Appeal.

"Subject as aforesaid, the provisions of the Supreme Court of Judicature Acts, 1873 and 1875, for the time being in force in relation to the appointment of ordinary judges of Her Majesty's Court of Appeal, and to their tenure of office, and to their precedence, and to their salaries and pensions, and to the officers to be attached to such judges, and all other provisions relating to such ordinary judges shall apply to the additional ordinary judges appointed in pursuance of this section in the same manner as they apply to the other ordinary judges of the said Court.

"For the purpose of a transfer to the Court of Appeal under this section service as a judge in a Court whose jurisdiction is transferred to the High Court shall be deemed to have been service as a judge in any one or more of such Divisions of the High Court as are in this section in that behalf mentioned, and for the purpose of the pension of any person appointed under this Act, an additional ordinary judge of appeal service in the High Court of Justice, or in any Court whose jurisdiction is transferred to the High Court of Justice or to the Court of Appeal, shall be deemed to have been service in the Court of Appeal.)"

The particular object of this clause was to materially strengthen the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Intermediate Court of Appeal.

Clause (Amendment of the Supreme Court of Judicature Acts in relation to Her Majesty's Court of Appeal),—(*Mr. Attorney General*), *brought up*, and read the first and second time.

Mr. CHARLEY moved to leave out, in lines 11, 12, and 13—

"and the vacancies so created in the High Court of Justice shall not be filled up, except in the event and to the extent hereinafter mentioned."

Applications at Chambers had been greatly increased in number under the new Acts, while there had been no corresponding increase in the number of Judges; and there was now almost as much difficulty in getting a case heard at the time appointed at Chambers as in getting a case heard at the time appointed in Court. On Circuit, owing to the paucity of Judges, Queen's Counsel sat and tried cases both at *Nisi Prius* and on the Crown side. To compel a prisoner to be tried before a Queen's Counsel, instead of one of the Judges of the land, amounted to something like a denial of justice. At quarter sessions Recorders and Chairmen sat, who had had much experience, to try minor offences; while on Circuit charges of the gravest importance were tried by Queen's Counsel, who had had no experience at all of criminal law. The inconvenience of appointing Queen's Counsel to try cases at *Nisi Prius* was shown at the late Manchester Assizes, where an eminent Queen's Counsel having been appointed to try a case of compensation for injuries sustained on a railway, the counsel for the plaintiff refused to appear before him, the reason being that the commissioner was counsel himself for a railway company. He had no objection to the transfer of the three Judges, but he objected to transferring them without filling up the vacancies so created. In the face of the statement of the hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) that there would be 1,000 remanets by the 1st of November next, in Middlesex and London only, it seemed an extraordinary thing to take away three of the Judges of First Instance and not fill up the vacancies so created in the Court below. He desired also to point out that the Court of Appeal sat during Circuit, and it seemed a strange way to strengthen the Court of Appeal to transfer to it Judges, who would be liable to go Circuit, and thus absent themselves for a considerable portion of the year. In the Court of Appeal also, the Judges, who went Circuit, could not sit on appeals from their own decisions on Circuit.

The CHAIRMAN, in putting the Question, observed that the hon. Member (Mr. Gregory) had an Amendment to propose in line 11, which must precede that of the hon. and learned Member for Salford.

Mr. GREGORY said, he had hoped that the Attorney General would have made some statement as to the manner in which he proposed to work the new system which he would inaugurate. The Attorney General constituted another division of the Intermediate Court of Appeal by the appointment of three additional Judges, and for this purpose to abstract three Judges from the Court of First Instance. Whether this was wise or necessary was a matter of considerable doubt. There was a considerable block in the administration of justice — a very large arrear in the Common Law Courts and also in the Court of Chancery, which had been materially increased by the fact that that Court had to take *vivâ voce* evidence. The obligation of the Court of Chancery to try out causes, instead of sending issues of fact to other Courts, greatly retarded the progress of business in the Chancery Courts, while the Vice Chancellors had not sufficient time to devote to matters which deserved their personal attention in Chambers; and, as was well known, there was also a block in the Common Law Courts. Under these circumstances, it certainly appeared to him that it was unwise to abstract Judges from the Courts of First Instance, without making any further provision for the business that was now so much in arrear; and he therefore proposed to leave it optional to take the Judges for the Court of Appeal from the High Court, instead of making it compulsory, by substituting the word "may" for the word "shall."

Amendment proposed, in line 11, to leave out the word "shall," and insert the word "may."—(*Mr. Gregory.*)

Sir HENRY JAMES said, that large issues were raised by the clause and the Amendments, and sooner or later they must be discussed. When the Judicature Act came into operation last November, there were sham arrears, which were soon disposed of; but under the working of the Act it had been found that the Judicial Staff was not equal to the demands made upon it, and it was no exaggeration to say that a dead-lock had resulted. Those who were chiefly prejudiced were the suitors and others who desired to appeal to the Courts of Law. About six weeks ago attention was called to the number of cases then waiting to be heard. In the Intermediate Court of Appeal there were 54 cases in arrear, and in London and Middlesex alone there were between 500 and 600 cases awaiting trial at *Nisi Prius.* He believed that at the beginning of the new legal year there would be fully 1,000 *Nisi Prius* cases in arrear. Matters were in this position when Lords Justices James and Baggallay wrote a letter stating that it was impossible, in the present state of the Appellate Court, to get through the business. That letter was communicated to the 18 legal Members of the House, and the conclusion which they came to was embodied in the Amendments of the Attorney General. It was then suggested that it was necessary to do two things—to increase the strength of the Court of Appeal by adding to its numbers, and its stability by ceasing to borrow Judges from the Primary Courts. No one could doubt that the Appellate Judges should be Appellate and not Primary Judges. The question then arose whence this additional strength should be derived. Some thought that it would be better to add at once two or three Judges to the Court of Intermediate Appeal. Every unnecessary addition to the number of Judges was, however, objectionable on two grounds, because it made all the other Judges do less work than need be, and because it lowered the standard of judicial qualification. When a greater demand was made on the Profession by creating 24 Judges where 12 used to be the number, a lower standard was inevitable. The best number of Judges was the number required to do the work, and no more. He considered that the additional strength required in the Court of Intermediate Appeal could be obtained from the Common Law Bench, where at present there was a great waste of judicial power. Why, for example, in *Nisi Prius* cases, should there be seen the spectacle of three Judges sitting with the greatest solemnity to hear cases which men of the most ordinary intellect would decide offhand in their counting-houses? In the Court of Chancery a single Judge was sufficient for such causes. Why, he asked, instead of having an increased number of Judges, should they not, by accepting the second Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General, economize judicial strength without affecting the public interest? If one Judge could dispose of cases of vastimportance in the Court of Chancery, why should not one Judge sit in a Court of Law and dispose of cases there? He was bound to say that these views having been expressed by the legal Members of the House the Attorney General had promptly taken steps, by placing his Amendments on the Paper, to carry them into effect. He wished the Court of Appeal to be like the Court of Bankruptcy, with greater weight and greater effect. The Amendments to be proposed by the Attorney General would be most beneficial to the Bench and to suitors generally, and he hoped that Members of his Profession would assist the Government in carrying them into effect.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL was ready to assent to the first clause proposed by the Attorney General, but in the interest of the public he could not support the second clause, by which, if it were passed, a Court of Law sitting *in Banco* would consist of one Judge only. He asked, was the practice in Chancery so entirely satisfactory that they could make conformable to it their practice in Common Law? He compared the position of a Vice Chancellor in dealing with a case with the position of a Judge and a jury, and he said that a suitor who went away from a Court *in Banco*, whether the verdict had been for him or against him, went away with a more complete satisfaction as to the result of the case than a man who went out of the Vice Chancellor's Chamber. He understood that this Act was to do something for suitors, but it began by giving three weeks more vacation than they had formerly. While he assented to the first clause, he as completely dissented from the second.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD said, it was admitted on all hands that the present Court of Appeal could not keep up with the business. It was also agreed that an addition must be made to the Court of Appeal, such as was now proposed by the hon. and learned Attorney General. The only remaining question, therefore, was how this was to be done. There were only two ways in which it could be done; either by increasing the number of Judges, or else by distributing the work so as to enable 15 Judges to do the work now done by 18. Now, the former alternative was out of the question, inasmuch as the Government had declared that under present circumstances they would not increase the number. He thought, therefore, the proposal that they should sit separately was one which ought to be tried. For his own part, he preferred a Judge sitting alone to a Judge sitting with another, or with two other Judges. When alone, one Judge had a full sense of his responsibility, which, if not lost, was weakened by association with another Judge. If he went wrong he could be set right by the Court of Appellate Jurisdiction. There was another improvement which might be adopted with advantage—namely, to make venues local, inasmuch as the accumulation of business in London was in a measure the result of the abolition of local venues. He trusted the Amendments would be accepted.

Mr. GRANTHAM thought that justice ought to be rendered to the Common Law Judges for the manner in which they had sought to fulfil their duties under the new system. He held that a great deal too much stress had been laid upon the working of the new system, with a view to its depreciation. It was not fair to say that the work had diminished, while the block had increased. The work disposed of now was far more important than under the old plan. The new system of pleading made it far more necessary to expose at once the ground of defence than was formerly the case, and these actions were brought to a speedier issue. A greater display of causes used to be made, because attorneys wished to make a show of the causes entered for trial, and the consequence was that many were entered which never were brought to a decision. He contended that the new system should have a fair trial. Many motions at Common Law of inferior importance might be made before a single Judge, and he would instance the example of cases brought before a Judge at Chambers to show how matters might be disposed of which would be considered of more importance if they were brought before a tribunal composed of more than a single person. As to the question of expense, he believed that the public would not grudge £10,000, or even £20,000 a-year for additional Judges, who would save enormous cost and delay to suitors. The Judicature Act was passed to produce a fusion of Law and Equity, so that the same Judge might be able to try all the questions connected with a case; but the system did not work in the way which had been expected, and Equity Judges now sent down issues to be tried at the Assizes by the Common Law Judges. It was not fair that one class of Judges should be able to relieve themselves at the expense of another, and he could easily understand that there should have been some feeling on the part of Judges who were helpless in the matter, because they had a loyal desire to finish the business of their Circuits, and were not men to "scamp" their work. In conclusion, he was sorry the measure could not be postponed till another year, when they might have more satisfactory legislation than that now before them.

Mr. NORWOOD felt, as a member of the mercantile community, that the operations of the Judicature Act, whatever might be the cause, had not given satisfaction to the public. Considerable alarm existed lest we should be placed under very serious disadvantages in our judicial procedure, consequent upon the new Acts. So far were the advantages promised to suitors from being realized that there was now almost as much difficulty in knowing what Court to apply to as ever there had been; the Long Vacation was longer than ever, and the suitors had none of the facilities for having their cases tried which they had so much reason to hope would be afforded to them. He could not disguise from himself the fact that out-of-doors it was asserted too frequently that the Judges had really not shown that anxious desire to accommodate themselves and the business of their Courts to the new system which might have been fairly expected from them. When the Act came into operation, counsel were refused information when they applied to the Bench for it, and one Judge boasted that he had not yet read the provisions of the Act. The Judges might have, by consultation among themselves, removed many of the difficulties which had arisen. They were salaried officers of the State, and it was their duty to regulate the business of their Courts, so that suitors might have the greatest possible facility in getting their rights adjusted.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that the Amendment which stood in his name was the result of the opinions expressed by the great bulk of the legal Members of the House, who ought to share the responsibility. It was admitted that the Intermediate Court of Appeal needed strengthening and improvement; and everybody admitted that the Bill would effect this object. Everybody agreed that to increase the number of Judges without such a step being necessary, would be the wrong thing to do. He would prefer that the new clauses which he had proposed should stand as they were on the Paper without being amended. If any further alteration were found necessary in the future they could be made with more confidence after they had gained the advantage of experience.

Mr. WHALLEY said, the late Lord Westbury had written to him expressing his deep regret that he was unable to appear in his place in Parliament to protest against the revolutionary, and, as he termed it, "most disastrous" scheme.

Mr. BULWER, as one of the legal Members of the House, disclaimed being in any way responsible for, or favourable to, the Amendments that had been proposed. For his part he protested against Amendments effecting so important an alteration in our judicial system being introduced and discussed in a thin House at that period of the Session. The House should not suppose that the legal profession were in favour of the changes, for from all the learned Gentlemen and learned Judges he had consulted, with the exception of some hon. and learned Gentlemen in that House, he had not heard a single voice in favour of them. One main argument urged in their favour was that Judges sitting alone in the Equity Courts gave entire satisfaction, and, if so, it was asked, why should not Common Law Judges do the same? He denied that Equity Judges sitting alone did give satisfaction; but even if they did there was no analogy whatever between the cases upon which, as a rule, they had to decide and those that came before a Judge and a jury. How, he would ask, was a long legal argument to be satisfactorily conducted at

Nisi Prius, and the time of the jury wasted in listening to what they were not expected to understand? And if the question were reserved for the subsequent consideration of a single Judge, and important interests depended upon it, it was contrary to all experience to suppose that the suitor against whom the decision was, would be satisfied with it, and, if not satisfied, he would be driven not as at present to the Court *in Banco*, but at a great increase of expense to the Court of Appeal. He ventured to prophecy that it would soon be found, if these Amendments became law, that the disposal of all business before a single Judge was neither "practicable" nor "convenient," and we should have to fall back upon the proviso empowering Divisional Courts to be held to replace the Courts *in Banco*. The proposal of the Attorney General was, in effect, to abolish the Court *in Banco*, and thus deprive the suitor of his First Court of Appeal. The inevitable result would be that the New Court of Appeal would be overwhelmed with the business which would flow into it, for that Court could only sit in two Divisions. To further subdivide it would be to diminish its authority, and if it consisted of but a few Judges it would have no greater weight than the existing Courts *in Banco*. Lord Westbury, to whom the hon. Member for Peterborough had alluded, once said that the reason why a certain Lord Chancellor generally called in one of his legal brethren to sit with him was, "that he was afraid to be left alone in the dark." The Attorney General proposed that for the future all our Judges should be left alone in the dark. It was, perhaps, a minor consideration, but not to be left entirely out of view, that, under our present system, our Judges acquired no inconsiderable portion of their education by sitting with their brethren *in Banco*. He hoped the Attorney General would hold his hand, and be content with the Bill as it came from the House of Lords.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, with regard to the statement as to the disapproval of this measure by the Judges, that, he was afraid, was a statement that must be made with regard to every measure that ever had been or ever would be proposed for the reform of the law. Looking back over many years of legal changes, he could not see any measure which had received the approval of Her Majesty's Judges. He regretted that the last speaker was not present at the meeting of the Profession which recommended the clause with remarkable unanimity.

MR. GREGORY presumed it was a meeting of the members of the Bar, as he was not present; but he believed that he represented the views of one branch of the Profession (the solicitors) and the interests of the other. The object of his Amendment was simply to render the measure permissive, and to give time for the further consideration of the question.

MR. NEWDEGATE remarked that constant efforts had been made to subordinate the Common Law to that of the Court of Chancery, and he believed that the effect of the clause proposed by the Government would be to intercept the proceedings at Common Law. He would vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Sussex rather than sanction a system of which all the Judges disapproved.

Question put, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 94; Noes 36: Majority 58.

MR. CHARLEY said that, as his Amendment to the Attorney General's new clause had been practically before the House, as well as that of the hon. Member for West Sussex (Mr. Gregory), and as he wihsed to economize time, he would not persevere with the clause which he had previously moved.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the following new clause:—

(Regulations as to business of High Court of Justice and divisional Courts of High Court.)

"On and after the first day of December one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six, every action and proceeding in the High Court of Justice, and all business arising out of the same, except as is hereinafter provided, shall, so far as is practicable and convenient, be heard, determined, and disposed of before a single judge, and all proceedings in an action subsequent to the hearing or trial, and down to and including the final judgment or order, always excepting any proceedings on appeal in the Court of Appeal, shall, so far as is practicable and convenient, be had and taken before the judge before whom the trial or hearing of the cause took place; Provided, nevertheless, That divisional courts of the High Court of Justice, may be held for the transaction of any business which may for the time being be ordered by rules of court to be heard by a divisional court; and any such divisional court when held, shall be constituted by two judges of the court and no more, unless the president of the division to which such divisional court belongs, with the concurrence of the other judges of such division, or a majority thereof, is of opinion that such divisional court should be constituted of a greater number of judges than two, in which case such court may be constituted of such number of judges as the president, with such concurrence as aforesaid, may think expedient; nevertheless the decisions of a divisional court shall not be invalidated by reason of such court being constituted of a greater number than two judges; and

"Rules of court for carrying into effect the enactments contained in this section shall be made in manner provided by 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875,' on or previously to the first day of December one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six, but may afterwards be altered in manner provided by the said Act; and

"There shall be repealed on and after the eleventh day of January, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, so much of sections forty, forty-one, forty-two, forty-three, forty-four, and forty-six of 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873,' as is inconsistent with the provisions of this section."

Mr. GREGORY moved to omit from the clause the condition "so far as is practicable and convenient," which he thought would render the clause valueless.

Sir HENRY JAMES thought a hard-and-fast line was undesirable, and he hoped the Amendment would not be accepted.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS moved the following Amendment to the clause, in line 22, after "shall be made," leave out to "said Act and," in line 25, and insert—

"On or before the first day of December, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six, and may be afterwards altered, and all rules of court to be made after the passing of this Act, whether made under 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875,' or this Act, shall be made by any three or more of the following persons, of whom the Lord Chancellor shall be one—namely, the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice of England, the Master of the Rolls, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and four other judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature, to be from time to time appointed for the purpose by the Lord Chancellor in writing under his hand, such appointment to continue for such time as shall be specified therein."

Mr. WHALLEY strongly objected to the Amendment. He thought that when it was proposed to change the whole system of their jurisprudence, they should be guided by the best authorities in the course they were asked to take.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he had carefully considered the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Denbigh, and he must say he considered it an improvement.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the following new clause:—

(Power in certain events to fill vacancies occasioned in High Court of Justice by removal of judges to Court of Appeal.)

"Whenever any two of the said paid judges of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have died or resigned, Her Majesty may, upon an address from both Houses of Parliament, representing that the state of business in the High Court of Justice is such as to require the appointment of an additional judge, fill up one of the vacancies created by the transfer hereinbefore authorized, by appointing one new judge of the said High Court in any Division thereof; and, on the death or retirement of the remaining two paid judges of the said Judicial Committee, Her Majesty may, upon the like Address, fill up in like manner another of the said vacancies, and from time to time fill up any vacancies occurring in the offices of judges so appointed."

Clause *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the following new clause:—

(Increase of allowance to retired Indian and Colonial Judges attending the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.—3 and 4 W. 4, c. 41, s. 30.)

"Whereas by the thirtieth section of the Act of the Session of the third and fourth years of the reign of King William the Fourth, chapter forty-one, and intituled 'An Act for the better administration of Justice in His Majesty's Privy Council,' it is provided that an allowance of four hundred pounds a year may be made to two members of His Majesty's Privy Council, having held such office of judge as therein mentioned in every year during which they attend the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the said Council as an indemnity for the expense which they may thereby incur, and whereas it is expedient to increase such allowance, be it enacted that the said section shall be read as if the words 'one thousand pounds' had been inserted therein in place of the words 'four hundred pounds.'"

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman appeared to fear that the retiring allowance would not secure Judges in this department. If the retiring allowance was increased to £1,000 a-year, he thought there was a probability of their having too many applicants for the position.

MR. WHALLEY opposed the clause. It was entirely inconsistent with our ordinary practice.

Clause *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the following new clause :—

(Continuation until 1st January 1878, of s. 34 of 38 and 39 Vic. c. 77, as to vacancies in legal offices.)

"Whereas by section thirty-four of 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875,' it is enacted that upon the occurrence of any vacancy in an office coming within the provisions of section seventy-seven of 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873,' the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain may, with the concurrence of the Treasury, suspend the making any appointment to such office for any period not later than the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, and may, if it be necessary, make provision in such manner as he thinks fit for the temporary discharge in the meantime of the duties of such office, and it is expedient to extend the said period as hereinafter mentioned: Be it therefore enacted as follows:

"The said section shall be construed as if the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight were therein inserted in lieu of the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven."

Clause *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL then moved the following new clause :—

(Appointment of deputy by district registrars.)

"A district registrar of the Supreme Court of Judicature may from time to time, but subject to such regulations as the Lord Chancellor may from time to time make, appoint a deputy, and all acts authorized or required to be done by, to, or before a district registrar may be done by, to, or before any deputy so appointed."

Clause *brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

MR. GREGORY opposed the clause, and urged that the system of appointing deputies for the administration of justice was open to grave objection and abuse.

MR. WHALLEY observed that the power of appointing a deputy-registrar would be open to very grave objection.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN considered that the appointment of a deputy should not be made without the sanction of the Lord Chancellor.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL thought that, under proper regulations, the appointment of a deputy might prove beneficial.

MR. GREGORY still urged his objections to the clause. This power of appointment was unlimited, and he hoped the clause would be reserved for further consideration.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 68; Noes 42: Majority 26.

On the Motion of the ATTORNEY GENERAL the clause was amended by adding that the appointment of deputy registrars should only be made "with the approval of the Lord Chancellor."

On the Motion of Mr. MORGAN LLOYD it was also added that the appointment should not be made for a longer period than three months.

Clause, as amended *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill.

MR. WATKIN WILLIAMS moved in page 4, after Clause 12, to insert the following clause :—

(Enforcing payment of costs.)

"Where, in any appeal to the House of Lords, the House of Lords shall order or adjudge any costs to be paid by any party or parties to such appeal to any other party or parties thereto, the cause, matter, or other proceeding in which the said appeal shall have been had, shall, if so ordered by the House of Lords, be remitted back to the Court of first instance for the purpose of enforcing the payment of such costs, and such last mentioned Court shall in such case issue such process for the recovery of such costs as shall be necessary and in accordance with the usual practice of such Court in enforcing the payment of damages or costs ordered to be paid by an order or judgment of such Court."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, believing the provision unnecessary, could not agree to its adoption.

Clause *negatived*.

Mr. CHARLEY moved the following new clause:—

(Writs of Assistance to be issued to all the Judges of the Supreme Court.)

"Writs of Assistance, under the Great Seal, shall be issued out of the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, commanding the attendance in the House of Lords of all the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature, to treat and give advice in Parliament in the same manner in all respects in which writs under the Great Seal have heretofore been issued out of the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, commanding the attendance of the Justices of either Bench, the Barons of the Exchequer and the Master of the Rolls, to treat and give advice in Parliament."

The hon. Member said, that it was purely owing to the historical accident that the Equitable Jurisdiction of the House of Lords was only 200 years old, while the Common Jurisdiction was coeval in its origin with the Constitution, that the Equity Judges were not summoned to advise the House of Lords. Now that Law and Equity were fused, it was important that the advice of the Equity Judges should be obtainable by the House of Lords. A similar clause to the one which he proposed was read a second time in the House of Commons on the Motion of Sir Edward Sugden (afterwards Lord St. Leonards) many years ago, and would be found in the Appendix to Sugden on "Property."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL objected to the clause, on the ground that it was an interference with the procedure of the House of Lords.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General, Bill to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Election Petitions and the inquiry into and prevention of corrupt practices at Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General and Mr. Secretary Cross.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 291.]

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, 9th *August,* 1876.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills — *Committee — Report*—Erne Lough and River * (189); Ardglass Harbour * (193); Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) * (190); Tralee Savings Bank * (202).

Report—Exhausted Parish Lands * (186).

Third Reading—Savings Banks (Barrister) * (198); Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates) * (199); Bishopric of Truro * (201); Juries Procedure (Ireland) * (196), and *passed.*

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at half past Two o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 9th *August,* 1876.

MINUTES.]—New Writ Issued—*For* Rutland, *v.* the Right honble. Gerard James Noel, First Commissioner of Her Majesty's Works and Buildings.

Public Bills — *Second Reading*—Cruelty to Animals [250]; Norwich and Boston (Corrupt Voters) * [244]; Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland) * [286].

Second Reading — Committee — Report—Winter Assizes (Ireland) * [290-292].

Committee—Report—Expiring Laws Continuance * [281]; Bow Street Police Court (Site) (*re-comm.*) * [257].

Considered as amended—Sheriff Courts (Scotland) [289].

Considered as amended—Third Reading—Appellate Jurisdiction [111]; Legal Practitioners * [43], and *passed.*

Third Reading—Suez Canal (Shares) * [189]; War Department and Post Office (Remuneration, &c.) * [206]; Parochial Records * [283]; Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment * [211], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) * [161]; Prisons (*re-comm.*) * [284]; University Education (Ireland) * [150].

MILITARY PRISONERS—CASE OF GUNNER CHARLTON.—QUESTIONS.

Sir EDWARD WATKIN asked the Secretary of State for War, What is the position of the case of Gunner Charlton;

and, whether it will be now necessary to provide by public subscription, in place of Government aid, some relief to this soldier, permanently disabled owing to barbarous treatment?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, that he must take some exception to the terms which were used in the latter part of the Question, because he could not admit that the soldier received barbarous treatment. He no doubt suffered materially; but he really thought that it was a strong measure, and a thing not at all called for, to charge those who had the charge of him in Millbank Prison with barbarous treatment. He had been, no doubt, in hospital ever since, and maintained at the public expense; and according to law, as the hon. Member for Hythe had been informed by the right hon. Gentleman the Paymaster of the Forces, it was not possible to pension a man until he had been absolutely discharged. Gunner Charlton had not been discharged. He still remained in hospital, and though he was recovering fast, a pension could not be allotted to him before he was released. In addition to that, it was required that the new Pension Warrant should come into force in order to enable him to be pensioned at all. So far as the War Department was concerned, this man had long been out of their hands. He had, however, recommended his case to the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital, who would, he believed, be prepared to deal with it. There was no stoppage on the part of the Treasury.

Sir EDWARD WATKIN inquired, whether it was not the fact that the Treasury Minute enabling this case to be dealt with had been for some time passed?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that was perfectly correct. The Warrant in a certain shape was passed by the Treasury; but since that time a question had arisen as to a technical point, with reference to some non-commissioned officers, and that had caused a little delay, but it did not affect the man Charlton, who could not be pensioned until he was removed from the hospital.

TURKEY—THE ATROCITIES IN BULGARIA.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. RITCHIE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government propose to take any steps with a view of making their influence directly felt in Bulgaria, in order to prevent the recurrence of events similar to those which took place in that district in the month of June last?

Mr. BOURKE: Several earnest representations have been made to the Porte with regard to the cruel and atrocious deeds that have taken place in Bulgaria, and the Porte has been informed that the recital of these deeds has created in the English mind the greatest indignation and horror. We have reason to believe that these occurrences have ceased some little time ago, and we have also reason to believe that exemplary punishment is being inflicted by the Porte upon the perpetrators of these dreadful barbarities. Her Majesty's Government have thought it advisable, with a view to bringing their influence directly to bear upon this unhappy Province, to appoint a Consular Agent upon the spot, in order that they may have the means of communicating directly with our Representative in Bulgaria. Under these circumstances the Consular Agent has been appointed at Philippopolis, and special directions and instructions will be given to him on the subject of the atrocities, so that Her Majesty's Government may now be said to be in direct communication with the scene of these atrocious deeds.

Mr. FAWCETT asked, When the Government intended to take the third reading of the Appropriation Bill, on which Motion his hon. Friend the Member for Poole (Mr. Evelyn Ashley) had given Notice that he would raise a debate in relation to this subject?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The arrangement which the Government had contemplated was to read the Appropriation Bill a third time to-morrow, and we had expected that it would not interfere with the Indian Budget. Under these circumstances we should have been prepared to proceed with the Lords' Amendments to the Merchant Shipping Bill on Friday. But the Notice which has been given by the hon. Member for Poole is one of such importance as to render it necessary that there should be a proper opportunity for discussion. Therefore, what we now propose is that we should now take the third reading of the Appropriation Bill on Thursday, because it would not be possible to do justice both to the Motion of the hon. Member for Poole and to the Indian Budget. The third reading of the Appropriation Bill will be taken on Friday; but we are not at the present moment in a position to say whether we should propose to take it at a Morning Sitting on Friday or in the evening at 4 o'clock. Notice will be given upon that subject. If we should be able to take it at a Morning Sitting on Friday we might be able to proceed with the Merchant Shipping Bill Amendments in the evening, but if we are not able to proceed with these Amendments then they must be taken on Saturday.

Afterwards—

Mr. LOWE asked, Whether the Papers which had been promised in reference to the atrocities in Bulgaria would be presented in time to be read before the debate?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, that he had presented these Papers yesterday, and hoped that they would be in the hands of Members to-morrow.

Mr. HAYTER: Including the letter which was read last night?

Mr. BOURKE: Yes.

EGYPT—MR. CAVE'S REPORT.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I wish to take the opportunity of making a personal statement. I sent word to the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) that I would do so, but I am afraid he may not have received my communication. It will be in the recollection of the House that last evening the hon. Member for Burnley made a statement to the effect that on a certain Friday night I communicated to the House a telegram from Cairo, stating that the Khedive no longer objected to the publication of Mr. Cave's Report—an announcement which he said caused a rise next morning in Egyptian stocks, but which had been known and been made the object of speculative purchases at Paris on the Friday morning. Answering on the spur of the moment I could merely state to the House what my part in the business had been, and that I had received the communication late on Friday evening and had immediately communicated it to the House. But I have this morning received from Mr. Rivers Wilson, who was at Cairo at the time, an important statement which I would ask the permission of the House to read. He says—

"16, Wilton Street, Belgrave Square,
"August 8, 1876.

"Dear Sir Stafford Northcote,—The telegram was sent at my instigation under the circumstances shortly described in the following extract from my diary;—

"'Friday, March 31, 1876.—Stanton lent me Cave's Report, which impressed me so favourably that (Stanton concurring and, indeed, suggesting) I asked Barrot Bey to procure me an interview with the Khedive, although it is Friday. The Khedive sent to say he would see me at 4. I went and took him draft of a statement to be sent through Stanton. He accepted it hardly with any hesitation, made some alterations which were improvements, wrote a note to Stanton, adding a postscript at my suggestion, asking for the announcement in the House of Commons that evening, if possible, that he agreed to the publication of the Report. I took the papers to Stanton, and he telegraphed at once.'

"You will observe that I did not see the Khedive until 4 o'clock. I was with him between one and two hours, and no previous intimation had been made to any one on the subject of my interview.

"My suggestion as to the announcement being made on Friday night was, as I explained to the Khedive, because it could not otherwise be communicated until the following Monday, and it was desirable that no time should be lost in removing the unfavourable impression that the refusal to sanction the publication of the Report had created.

"You will see by the above statement that the receipt of the intelligence in Paris on Friday morning was impossible.

"I am, &c.,
"C. Rivers Wilson.

"I hope you will make any use of this letter that you may think desirable."

CRIMINAL LAW—THE QUEEN *v.* CASTRO—THE TRIAL AT BAR—THE ORTON PORTRAITS AND PAINTINGS.

QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether there is any and what objection to return to Elizabeth Jury, a daughter of George Orton, certain oil paintings, viz., the portraits of her father and mother, which were lent by her for the use of the Court in the late Trial at Bar of the Tichborne Claimant, and as to which repeated application have been made in vain to all the authorities concerned in the matter?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that technically the hon. Gentleman had given him Notice of his Question by the mere fact of his having placed it on the Paper of the House; but until five minutes ago, when he entered the House, he had not seen it. So far as his memory was concerned, he could not charge it with a knowledge of anything about Mrs. Jury's paintings, but he would make inquiry into the matter.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he would repeat his Question to-morrow.

EXPIRING LAWS (CONTINUANCE) BILL—[Bill 281.]

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Secretary Cross.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BUTT, referring to the discussion which took place two years ago, and the pledge that no Bills of importance should be renewed in this manner, said that all the Bills in the Schedule, and some of them were of importance, would remain in force until the end of next Session. He thought that it would be better, in order to put a stop to the practice he had referred to, that the Bills should remain in force until the 31st of December, instead of the end of the then next Session of Parliament. He would, therefore, move as an Amendment, that the 2nd clause which dealt with the matter should be altered by substituting the words "until the thirty-first of December next" for the words "and to the end of the then next Session of Parliament."

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER assented to the alteration.

Clause *amended* accordingly.

Bill *reported*, as amended; to be considered *To-morrow.*

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL.

[*Lords*]—[Bill 111.]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD moved the insertion of a new clause, to provide that—

> "In any cause tried at the Assizes, an application for a new trial or to set aside the verdict or judgment, or to enter any other verdict or judgment, may be made within the first four days of the sittings of the High Court of Justice in Middlesex next after the trial."

Clause (Application for new trial in cases tried at the assizes,)—(*Mr. Morgan Lloyd,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL objected to the clause, and considered the matter one of procedure, which ought to be left in the hands of the Judges, to be regulated by Rules of Court.

Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS said, that while approving the object of the clause, he agreed with the hon. and learned Attorney General.

Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. MARTEN, with the leave of the Committee, withdrew a clause of which he had given Notice, giving power to stay execution pending appeal.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 3, to leave out the words "in the same manner in all respects as."—(*Mr. Charley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

On the Motion of Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Amendment made, in Clause 8, page 3, line 39, by inserting after "Lords of Appeal," "in the name of the House of Lords."

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 19, to leave out the words "except so far as may be authorised by orders of the House of Lords."—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE moved, as an Amendment, in page 5, line 21, the omission from the 13th clause of the words relating to the appointment of Episcopal assessors of the Judicial Committee, contending that the Court ought to be a lay Court and deal only with questions of law, and that it ought to be left a tribunal of the same character as was constituted under the Public Regulation Act. Having lately in Committee moved the omission of the provision for providing the Judicial Committee with Episcopal assessors at the hearing of ecclesiastical appeals, he had, as he conceived, been really supported by the independent opinion of the House. It was true that on the division there was a tie, and that according to the etiquette which governed his actions, the Chairman was at that stage compelled to give his voice for the retention of the provision, because another opportunity would be afforded for again considering the question. But in that tie one side was composed of Members voting according to their convictions, while the other was largely made up of the occupants of the Treasury Bench, who had no option as to their votes; with, indeed, the exception of his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War, who had significantly walked out of the House. He, himself, had upon that occasion so fully given his reasons why Parliament ought not to consent to a mixed Court of lawyers and ecclesiastics to deal with legal questions, and he had so clearly proved the unanimity of the House upon the matter in 1873, that he would not repeat his reasons. Only he must refer to an argument which he had then overlooked. Under the Public Worship Regulation Act the Judicial Committee stood without Episcopal members or assessors. He did not pretend that he had liked that Act, but Parliament had; and after so enthusiastically passing it, it was bound consistently to carry out its principles, one of which would be violated by the retention of the words of which he again moved the omission.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 21, to leave out from the word "Majesty" to the word "Whereas," in page 6, line 3.—(*Mr. Beresford Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, it was not often that he agreed with his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Beresford Hope) on ecclesiastical matters, and he was glad on this question to be in accordance with him, and he cordially approved of and supported the Amendment to strike out the lay element from the Bill. It was never intended that the Judicial Committee should be regarded as a theological tribunal. The great lawyers knew quite as much of theology as the Bishops. It was almost impossible to have a greater concurrence of opinion than there was on this subject. If the Court should require any knowledge on theological points they would easily be able to obtain it. He could see no reason for not following the arrangement come to in 1874 when they passed the Public Worship Regulation Act.

MR. CHARLEY said, that the movement to reject the Bishops from the Court sprang from those clergymen of the Church of England who desired to disobey the judgments of the Privy Council. If the Bishops were removed, these clergymen would insist that, as the Privy Council was a purely secular tribunal, it had no right to expect obedience from spiritual persons.

MR. WATKIN WILLIAMS wished to explain that the vote which he was now about to give was different from the one which he gave on the previous night on the same question. He was under the impression that the question was between a purely legal tribunal on one side and a mixed tribunal of lawyers and ecclesiastics on the other; but that was not so, as the Bishops were to be merely assessors, and would form no part of the Court. Certain persons in the Church of England supported the Amendment because they made the purely legal character of the tribunal a ground for repudiating its decisions altogether. The presence of Bishops as assessors would go a long way to defeat this objection.

LORD HENRY SCOTT did not think that the presence of the Bishops inspired any additional confidence in the judgments of the Committee of the Privy Council, because they did not sit as Judges with responsibility, but simply as Assessors. For his part, he would rather have the judgment of lay Judges free from the influence of irresponsible Assessors.

MR. WHALLEY held that the presence of the Bishops led to nothing but confusion. He would like to ask the hon. and learned Member for Denbigh (Mr. Watkin Williams) to consider whether any possible constitution of the Court could satisfy those whom it was its object to control, and who avowed that they remained in the Church of England for the express purpose of Romanizing the Church. [*Laughter, and cries of* "Agreed!"] He claimed the indulgence of the House, which he thought ought to be allowed to him as a layman. He considered the clause a monstrous proposition to bring religious "experts" in to assist the Judges. He could not conceive anything more monstrous. He was glad that the hon. and learned Member for Oxford had come to the rescue of the Constitution.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he was unable to consent to the Amendment. The clause did not make the Archbishops and Bishops Judges of the Court, but enabled Her Majesty to make them Assessors in order that they might, if it should be necessary, give advice to the Court on ecclesiastical matters. For those reasons he thought it better that the whole of the clause should stand as it was. Experience showed that judgments gave more satisfaction to moderate men when the Court had Episcopal assistance.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD agreed with the hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope). The object of introducing the Archbishops and Bishops as Assessors, was either to assist the Judges in the interpretation of the law, or else for the purpose of modifying the law by the introduction of extraneous matters and opinions not based upon the fair and grammatical construction of the Articles and formulas of the Church. For the former purpose the help of the Archbishops and Bishops was unnecessary, and the latter was objectionable on principle, inasmuch as the tribunal was to declare and not make or alter the existing law. He should certainly support the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University.

COLONEL MAKINS supported the Amendment.

MR. WHITWELL did not see any objection to Bishops sitting as Assessors, so long as they did not influence the judgment of the Court.

MR. HENLEY was glad the Government had determined to abide by their clause.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 55; Noes 42: Majority 13.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that the hon. and learned Attorney General had promised to reconsider the clause increasing the allowance to retired Indian and Colonial Judges attending the Privy Council. He wished now to ask him whether there would be any advantage in raising the salaries of these Assessors from £400 to £1,000 a-year? The hon. and learned Gentleman was proceeding to comment on the subject, when——

MR. SPEAKER pointed out that the hon. and learned Gentleman would not be in Order unless he meant to conclude with a Motion.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that in that case he would move to omit the clause. The services of those Judges might not be required, and he did not like to see hypothetical offices with £1,000 a-year created for persons whose services might not be required at all. Such a proceeding would tend to encourage jobs.

Amendment proposed, That the Clause be omitted.—(*Sir William Harcourt.*)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he had considered the subject, and thought that the clause should be adopted. The existing Act contemplated a time when the Lords in Ordinary might not have among their body any Members with special knowledge of Indian and Colonial law. There were now two judicial Members of the Committee of Privy Council who were conversant with Indian law, and there would be no necessity at present to fill up these appointments. These assessors would be appointed not under this Bill, but under the existing Act, and the clause would enable them to receive a more adequate remuneration than £400 a-year by substituting the salary of £1,000 a-year.

MR. WHALLEY said, the principle proposed was an entirely new one. The Government were making this Bill a money Bill—a mere speculative question. The proposal was most unconstitutional and anomalous.

MR. LOWE said, a salary of £400 a-year, inserted in the original Bill, was now proposed to be raised to £1,000 a-year. He should have thought that increase of salary was only justified when earned by services. He would appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say whether it was desirable to raise salaries prospectively for places which were not intended at present to be filled up. When the occasion occurred, the Government could come to the House for the salary. He protested in the name of the taxpayers against a proceeding which was contrary to the whole genius of our finance, and might be fraught with the grossest jobbery.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that after the appeals made to him, he would yield his own opinion, and consent to the clause being negatived.

Amendment *agreed to;* clause *struck out* accordingly.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he must now appeal to the House to read the Bill a third time, as the matter was one of urgency. He would accordingly move the third reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

MR. WHALLEY said, that, under the circumstances upon which he then addressed the House, at a time when it was laying unhallowed hands upon the principles of the Constitution as embodied in the Common Law, he could scarcely call it a privilege, for he rather thought it a misfortune that he happened to be a Member of it. He had had much experience as a lawyer, and in that House, and he must say that although that subject had been under consideration for some years, he had failed to master it. Four or five years ago the House was called upon to pass a Bill, and it had since been led on from Session to Session until they were now told that unless they passed the present measure all would be thrown into confusion. He appealed from those benches to the Judges of the land, and he exhorted them to persevere in the policy they had adopted of protesting against the ignorant and most ill-considered action of the House in disregarding and subverting the principles of our jurisprudence. For centuries the people of this country had had to contend against the insidious encroachments of those enemies of the Common Law, the jurists and members of the Court of Chancery. Some of these learned gentlemen were no more to be regarded as custodians of the law and liberties of the people than a pack of wolves were to be considered as guardians of a flock of sheep. He entered his protest against destroying a system of law which had no parallel in the history of the world, and which, once destroyed, could not be restored. The result of these efforts would be to reduce the Common Law to the state of the civil law. While entering this protest, he must also express a hope that the Judges would have sufficient strength of character and good sense to adhere to the principles characteristic of the system of Common Law. In conclusion, he could not help bearing his testimony to the ability which the hon. and learned Attorney General had shown in conducting the measure through the House.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL [*Lords.*]

(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

[BILL 250.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that in the observations he had to make he hoped he would not wound the most sensitive feelings of those who were engaged in the medical profession, or in the pursuit of scientific inquiry. They lived now, as had been well said, in an age of progress, and probably in no intellectual pursuit had greater progress been made than in medical science and scientific inquiry. One of the results of that great advance had no doubt been a tendency to increase experiments made for scientific and medical purposes upon living animals, for the purpose of finding out something that might tend to alleviate human suffering and prolong human life. Such experiments had prevailed very much more abroad than they had in England; but even here, for some years, the tendency to pursue this peculiar branch of study had been on the increase; and the increase was not only present, but also prospective. There could be no doubt that in some of the principal medical schools experiments by way not only of original research, but as demonstrations to students, were growing to a considerable degree, and that a strong feeling had been raised throughout the country by the circulation of reports of many painful experiments that had been made, and also by the publication of a *Handbook* of Physiological Science, intended for beginners, which described very many such experiments. The word "beginners" misled many persons, and it was thought that a great number of unqualified persons were allowed to perform experiments which they could not perform properly, and of which they did not know the value. From all those circumstances a very strong feeling arose in the country against this practice, and the result of that feeling was tested by a meeting which was held in London in 1874, soon after which a Bill was brought into the other House by the noble Lord (Lord Henniker), and another one in this House by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Lyon Playfair) for the purpose of putting some control on a practice which was growing, and was likely to grow. He wished to explain what the course of the Government had been in the matter. Well, Her Majesty's Government knew that there were two sides taken on this as on all other matters of a strongly marked and very opposite character. There were a great number of persons of the very highest character who desired to put a stop to the experiments altogether, and there were a great number of persons who were entirely and very properly devoted to scientific research who took a distinctly opposite view, and who thought that any control or check put upon this practice was to be deprecated, because it would injure the progress of scientific investigation. In this matter, as in many others, perhaps, the House would be of opinion that the truth lay between the two extremes. Parliament had no knowledge as to the extent or nature of the practices in question, and there was reason to believe that the country was equally not well informed upon the matter; and the Government were therefore of opinion that before legislation could be proposed on the subject a thorough investigation by the most competent persons ought to be made. In the interests, therefore, not only of humanity, but also of science, Her Majesty's Government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the question. It was not for him, having had something to do with the appointment of that Commission, to say much about it; but he believed the general feeling had been, and was still, that those who were appointed were fully qualified to make a careful and impartial investigation of the facts, and to put them before Parliament in such a way as to insure a wise and proper conclusion being arrived at upon the question. The Commissioners had made their Report, having taken a great deal of evidence. It was not his intention to enter fully into that evidence, but a considerable amount of evidence was brought before the Commissioners, some very strong reasons were given why experiments should be made, and the whole matter was thoroughly investigated. He did not propose to go into details on this part of the question, but he thought a considerable part of the Report must be satisfactory to the House. The Commissioners bore testimony to the general feeling of humanity that prevailed among all classes in this country, and they did not confine that statement to the laity and the unlearned, but extended it to those who were actually practising the pursuit of scientific inquiry and research in connection with the medical profession, and the general result of the inquiry that had taken place was, that among those persons who performed scientific experiments and carried on medical investigations there was a general feeling of humanity prevailing. The Secretary of the Cruelty to Animals Society gave his opinion, in which he said that he readily acknowledged that he had discovered no single case of wanton cruelty committed during experiments for scientific purposes; and that anæsthetics were used where it was consistent with the success of the experiment. It was therefore only just to the scientific world and to the medical profession to adopt the view of the Commissioners not only as to the general tendency to humane feelings which prevailed among the laity, but among those who pursued the investigations in question. A great distinction must be drawn between the way in which those matters had been treated abroad and in this country. He believed that a great deal of the horror and strong feeling that had arisen was caused by what had taken place abroad; but in this country there had been very few of these cruel experiments practised, though at the same time there had been a strong feeling, no doubt, that the tendency to make experiments of the kind was growing in this country, and that some control should be put upon it with a view to prevent those horrid practices here which were but too frequent abroad. The feeling of the scientific world upon the matter was well shown by a series of resolutions which were passed at a meeting of the British Association which was held at Edinburgh in 1871. The resolutions were passed by men of great eminence in the scientific world directly interested in the subject, and they said that no experiment which could be performed under the influence of anæsthetics should be otherwise performed; that no painful experiment was justifiable for the mere purpose of illustrating a law or fact already demonstrated; that whenever it was necessary for the investigation of a new truth to make a painful experiment, every effort should be made that the sufferings inflicted should be as little and as brief as possible; that every effort should be made to ensure success in order that the suffering inflicted might not be wasted; that for that reason no painful experiment ought to be performed by unskilled persons, or with insufficient instruments or assistance, or in a place not suited for that purpose; and that operations ought not to be performed on living animals for the mere purpose of attaining greater professional dexterity. In those resolutions they had a law which, if properly carried out and enforced, would greatly mitigate the evils arising from the practice referred to, and they at all events showed that the tendency of those gentlemen was towards humanity, and that nothing was further from their minds than the needless infliction of pain. It might, then, be asked, if such was the general tendency of those by whom the investigations were carried on, what was the need of legislation at all? Well, the fact of those resolutions having been passed showed the necessity of some regulation being laid down, and there could be no security that the resolutions or anything like them would be regarded or enforced unless there was legislation. There was no question that even in the highest quarters—he spoke especially of foreign countries — cruelties had been practised by scientific persons, and it would be found in the Report that Dr. Sharpey spoke of "that infamous experiment of Majendie," while Dr. Carpenter mentioned that in experiments he had witnessed cases of "perfect callousness to animal suffering." Another celebrated person said that he had no regard for the sufferings of the animals experimented upon; he had no time to think of that whilst conducting the experiment, his only object being to perform the experiment and to learn as much from it as possible. It should be borne in mind that it was not intended that they should legislate for the best class of persons who performed these experiments in this country, but for those who might be tempted to make these experiments without proper knowledge and without any definite object, and also without proper appliances, and without that general instruction which was absolutely necessary to justify the making of such an experiment. It should be remembered that it had been reported that many of these experiments had been made "for no purpose that could possibly merit the name of legitimate scientific research." It should also be borne in mind that they were legislating not simply as against one class, but rather that they were endeavouring to put in practice and carry out simply the resolutions of the British Association. He would say one word with regard to those persons who wished that these practices should not continue at all. Any one who read the Report would see that so far as the prolongation of human life and the mitigation of human suffering were concerned, much had been learned by experiments of this kind; and if we were permitted to inflict pain at all upon dumb animals, it surely must be allowed for the attainment of objects like these. He did not mean that every experiment that took place could possibly be expected to add to the result to which he had alluded. The Commissioners reported that it was impossible to prevent experiments upon living animals for the attainment of knowledge which would be applicable to the mitigation of human suffering or the prolongation of human life; and that even if we could do so, we should thereby drive our students to foreign countries. Absolute prevention, also, if possible, would not be reasonable if the greatest benefit as to human suffering could be derived from such experiments. Her Majesty's Government joined in those conclusions, and with no wish to throw any stigma or slur upon any one who practised medical science, he must still say that we must do something to prevent those things happening in England that undoubtedly had happened abroad; and the object of the Bill was to place under necessary, but under no unnecessary, control or restriction those who should perform experiments. Now, let them see how the Bill would work. The principle upon which it went was, that persons should not perform experiments on living animals calculated to give pain, except under the restrictions laid down in the Bill. The first restriction was, that they should be performed with the view only of the attainment of new discoveries in physiology, or knowledge that would tend to the prolongation of human life, or the mitigation of human suffering. It then provided that the experiments should be made in some registered place and by persons who had licences—with an exception he would shortly mention — the animal being during the whole experiment under the influence of anæsthetics of sufficient power to prevent it having pain; and that if the experiment was concluded before the power of the anæsthetic ceased, the animal should be destroyed. Then again the experiment was not to be performed in a hospital or lecture-room, and must not be performed for the obtainment of manual skill. A general licence would be refused for any experiment, but if for special reasons that could be shown it were refused to perform an experiment without anæsthetics, then a special licence would be required. Again, if experiments were necessary, not for the definite purpose of obtaining knowledge which would tend to the alleviation of human suffering, or the prolongation of life, but with a view to test the truth of some alleged discovery, for these, too, special licences would be required, and it was provided that in no case should there be any public exhibition of these experiments. Nothing could be more demoralizing than such an exhibition, and therefore there was an absolute prohibition of any such exhibition. Now, who was to give the certificates that would be required under the Bill? Practically they would be given by the Secretary of State; but no one could apply for any licence, certainly not for any special licence, except on the recommendation of the heads of the learned Bodies named in the Bill. That was practically the whole of the Bill, except Clause 5, which was framed to prevent experiments being performed upon certain animals, such as dogs and cats, without there being special certificates, and also a provision for inspection. The House was aware that the measure had been much discussed in "another place," and before the Medical Council; and on one occasion when it was discussed by the latter Body the discussion lasted three days, and the result of the discussions had been that without infringing on the principles of the Bill, certain modifications might be made in it which would not at all interfere with what the Government really wanted to do. The first proposition which he had to make was as to the registered places. No doubt, every place where public instruction should be given should be registered; but it was provided that every person who had a licence should also register the place where the experiment was to be performed. Now, it had been represented according to the fact that many of the highest and most eminent men in their Professions—the most fitted, probably, to perform those experiments—had no special places wherein to do so, and they felt not unnaturally that there was some indignity placed upon them if they were to have their private residences registered—a fact which would give a totally false impression as to their practices. After consulting many persons, therefore, he had come to the conclusion that whilst every place for the performance of experiments for the purpose of instruction should absolutely be registered, it should in all other cases be left to the Secretary of State, in granting the licences, to say that in such cases the private residence need not be registered. Then, again, as to experiments on dogs and cats. One great objection raised was, that persons performing experiments would always have to go for a special certificate when they wanted to touch these animals. There was no doubt that there were certain experiments made for the purpose of alleviating suffering and prolonging life which could only be made on carnivorous animals—rabbits or hares would not answer the purpose; and so long as anæsthetics were used, and no pain inflicted, it made no difference what the animal was; but if anæsthetics were not used, the Bill would be so altered that in that case they would have to get a special licence to experiment upon the particular animal. One great grievance was, that there must be a special licence for each particular instance; but now that would not be required. In Clause 11 he proposed that any application for a licence should first of all be submitted for approval to the President of one of the Societies named in the clause. The licence having been granted, any prosecution instituted against a licensed person could only be instituted by the sanction of the Secretary of State; but as to other persons, the law could be put in force by the police. There was only one other Amendment he need mention, and it was this, that in the case of low-class animals—invertebrate and cold-blooded animals—the provisions of the Bill would not apply. In those Amendments the House would see that Her Majesty's Government had not given up a single principle, while they showed that there was no intention whatever to cast a slur upon the Medical Profession, to which they were all so deeply indebted. The question was one as to which, no doubt, feeling was easily roused and excited, but he could conceive nothing more to be deprecated than that it should be the subject of agitation throughout the country. They would have exaggerations brought forward; those exaggerations would be denied; the consequence being the greatest possible conflict between the medical and scientific world and those who took hasty views upon the subject, and that would be a misfortune for both sides. He, therefore, implored those who were engaged in medical and scientific pursuits to accept what practically had been already accepted by very many of their number—to consider the measure, and see whether it was not in accordance with the resolutions to which he had referred. If all the details of the experiments which had been performed abroad were published in England, it would have a most demoralizing effect. For all practical purposes the Bill would carry out the resolutions of the British Association; and, on the other hand, he would implore those who thought that it would be wise to put a stop to these things, that even if the Government wished this, it would be impossible to do it. The effect would be to send our students to foreign parts instead of their being educated in England, and the sufferings of animals would be by no means diminished. The Bill, if passed, would set an example to the world that the medical and scientific men of this country had put down the infliction of unnecessary cruelty and pain, under the guise of scientific inquiry, and that they would not permit experiments to be performed with no definite object in view by persons who were not qualified to do so, and in places not suitable for the purpose. He implored the House, in the discussion of the Bill, to avoid all causes of irritation, and said that in passing it they would establish a principle, in the cause of humanity, from which this country would never be able to retreat.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

DR. WARD (who had placed on the Paper a Motion for the rejection of the Bill) said, he did not like to oppose the second reading after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, whom he thanked for the generous way in which he had treated a much-abused Profession in the face of a popular outcry, in which they had been vilified through the gross ignorance that prevailed on this matter. He (Dr. Ward), however, felt that those agitators who did so much to excite that outcry would fail in the object they set before themselves. The Amendments which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State had announced his readiness to accept would almost entirely remove the objections which the Medical Profession held against the Bill, yet although it had been accepted by a number of medical men, it was in itself most objectionable. It was the outcome of an agitation which for years had been shown to be unfounded, for the Report of the Royal Commissioners stated that not more that 20 persons were engaged in the practice of vivisection in this country. The horrors that were said to be perpetrated by physiologists had been greatly exaggerated; and it had been shown that they were as careful of the feelings of animals as any hon. Member in that House, by the constant use of anæsthetics. It was a disgrace to the country that such a slur should have been cast on a body of men who had done so much for suffering humanity, and who had in many instances operated on themselves. He could assure the House that the sentiment of humanity was as strong in physiologists as it was in those who had agitated this question. The Royal Commission reported that there was not the slightest proof that vivisection exercised any demoralizing influence over medical students. There was no evidence to show the necessity of this legislation, but, on the contrary, that men of position in the Profession could be trusted in the future, as they had been in the past, to carry out these experiments. It was necessary that experiments should be made upon living animals in order to the furtherance of physiological science, and the question came whether surgeons should experiment upon dumb animals which had been placed under the influence of anæsthetics, or upon their patients. Accordingly, there had been an increase in the number of cases of vivisection arising out of the increase of anæsthetics, but there had been no increase of cruelty and pain to the animals operated on. This was not a question between humanity on the one hand, and modern science on the other, and the anti-vivisectionists had no right to arrogate to themselves the defence of the cause of humanity against those who had done more for suffering humanity than any other body. Far greater cruelty was practised towards animals in field sports and in preparing them for food, and yet it was proposed to legislate only for that small class by whom experiments were conducted carefully, scientifically, and comparatively painlessly, and there was no attempt to put Martin's Act in force in those other directions. For one case of suffering inflicted by the Medical Profession there were millions of cases in field sports; but he challenged the anti-vivisectionists to legislate against cruelty in sports. The agitation against vivisection was utterly fallacious, and it was founded on false grounds in order to cast insult and calumny on those who had laboured in the cause of humanity.

Dr. Ward

The Bill would probably be a harmless one, and therefore he should not pursue his opposition to it; but as the agitation had been found to be false and absurd, so he feared the legislation, coming out of it, would also be absurd, inasmuch as it would only deal with a small branch of the subject. Many discoveries which had resulted in good to humanity, and had also lessened the sufferings of animals, had followed upon experiments in vivisection, and he saw no reason why legislation should be specially directed against a branch of inquiry which had done so much of good. By the practice of vivisection the circulation of the blood was discovered, and vaccination, heart disease, and other maladies ameliorated; and now they were called inhuman because a couple of donkeys and other animals had been sacrificed in order to obtain the required knowledge. The result of passing stringent measures of this kind would be to turn the experiments by bad and inexperienced practitioners on man instead of on animals.

Amendment proposed to leave out "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "this day month."—(*Dr. Ward.*)

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK: Sir, we enter on the discussion of this painful subject with one great advantage—namely, that we are all anxious as far as possible to adopt a course which may tend to diminish suffering. This is the object with which the Bill has been introduced, and I hope that before this discussion is closed this House and the country will also feel that the Medical Profession are, to say the least, as anxious to avoid all unnecessary suffering as any other class of Her Majesty's subjects. Mr. Darwin expressed, I am sure, the general sentiments of English men of science when he said that to perform painful experiments without anæsthetics, when the same investigations might have been made with them, deserved detestation and abhorrence. We must, however, approach the subject calmly, and consider the real facts with which we have to deal. We often hear of tempering justice with mercy; in this case we must not allow our natural feeling for mercy to lead us into injustice, and we must be careful that in the endeavour to diminish pain and suffering we do not defeat the very object we have at heart. Many persons, for instance, really appear to believe that medical students are in the habit of performing experiments involving pain in their own houses. Witness after witness, however, assured the Commission that this was not the case, and it is, at any rate, absolutely certain that they are not encouraged to do so by their teachers. But perhaps the strongest evidence on this point is that of Mr. Colam, the Secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, who told the Commission that in the whole course of his inquiry he had only met with one instance of a case of vivisection performed by a student. Much, certainly, of the feeling which has been aroused throughout the country has arisen from an impression that painful operations are performed on living animals before students for purposes of instruction; but the evidence taken before the Royal Commission, on the contrary, proves clearly that in such cases the animals are always rendered insensible by anæsthetics. The Commission examined witnesses representing Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, the great London and various other medical schools, all with the same result. Drs. Burdon Sanderson and Foster state that in all experiments which are used for demonstrative purposes the animals are anæsthetized. Dr. Ferrier, of King's College, had never heard of an experiment for demonstration which was performed without anæsthetics. Mr. Schäfer, of University College, was asked whether his experiments were always performed under anæsthetics, and he said always. He was then asked—"So that the animals suffered no pain?" He said—"Not the least." Dr. Legge, of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, was asked whether all his experiments were performed under anæsthetics. He replied that they were. Dr. Gamgee, of Owens College, stated that in no case had pain been inflicted on any animal for the purpose of demonstration. I am reluctant to weary the House by quoting, and these answers may be taken to represent the rest, so that the evidence is conclusive that in experiments for educational purposes anæsthetics are used. Perhaps, however, I may refer to one other witness—namely, the Secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals—as the strongest that could be brought forward. He stated that he had made inquiries at every school in London, and found that the animals operated on were previously placed under the influence of narcotics. Again, in experiments made for purposes of research, it comes out clearly from the evidence taken before the Royal Commission that anæsthetics are used as much as is possible. Considering all the hard things which have been said of physiologists, it is, I think, very remarkable that, as a matter of fact, not a single case of wanton cruelty has been established, and that it has been shown that anæsthetics have always been used whenever this could be done without invalidating the experiment. This fact, again, rests on evidence which for this purpose must, I think, be deemed most conclusive—namely, on the authority of the Secretary of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. As regards medical men, Mr. Colam was asked—

> "Now, in your own personal experience, which you say has existed for about 15 years, have you known instances yourself where cruelty has been practised by private medical men in their own houses towards animals?"

to which he answered, "Not any." He was then asked whether one such case had come to the knowledge of one of the officers of the Society, to which he replied that, as far as he knew, it had not. And now as regards the diminution of suffering which has resulted from experiments on living animals. Many important discoveries have been made by means of vivisection which, in the opinion of the whole Medical Profession, could not have been arrived at in any other way. Harvey's great discovery, for instance, of the circulation of the blood was made by means of experiments on living animals. This statement rests not only on the authority of the Commissioners, but upon that of Harvey himself. To vivisection, again, we owe Sir Charles Bell's important discoveries on the functions of the different nerves of the face: previous to which discoveries it was the common practice of surgeons to divide the facial nerve for the cure of neuralgia, whereas it is now known that this nerve exercises no influence on sensation, and that the division for the relief of pain is consequently a useless operation. To the researches of Hunter we owe the present knowledge of the mode of recovery of an artery after ligature, previous to which knowlege many lives were lost from our ignorance of the nature of the process of repair. Galvani's experiments on the frog, simple as they may appear, have led up, through the genius of Volta, Oersted, and our own countrymen, Davy, Faraday, Thompson, Tyndall, and others, to all that we know about electricity and magnetism. Without experiments on living animals, we should never have had the use of ether or of chloroform, for the discovery of which we are indebted to our illustrious countryman, Sir James Simpson. Lastly, I might refer to the discovery of vaccination, which has not only caused an immense diminution of a very painful disease, but has been, I believe truly, said to have saved more lives than the wars even of Napoleon destroyed. Turning to its legal aspect, there is certainly no more dreadful crime than that of secret poisoning. Of such cases, few have taken a deeper hold of the public mind than that of Palmer, and it is not too much to say that the conviction of that man rested mainly on evidence derived from the experiments made on living animals. If I am told that it is better that criminals should escape than that a few animals should suffer, I might refer to another case, mentioned by Dr. Taylor, in which a poor woman was accused of having poisoned her stepchild with arsenic. That the child had died of this poison was undoubted. The woman had arsenic in her possession, and her defence was that she had rubbed the child's head with an ointment of white precipitate mixed with arsenic. At that time it was not believed possible that poison thus applied to the outside of the body could find its way into the stomach, and this poor woman would certainly have been tried for murder, and perhaps convicted, if Dr. Taylor had not found by experiments on living animals that this actually could happen. Sir George Duckett, the President of the Society for the Abolition of Vivisection, tells us that medical science has arrived at its extreme limits, and has little to learn. Those, however, who are most profoundly acquainted with the present state of our medical knowledge will most entirely disagree with this opinion; and though it is, of course, never easy to foresee the course of future progress, still there are some cases in which we seem to be on the very eve of important discoveries. Thus that fatal and distressing malady, *angina pectoris*, seems likely to be brought within the domain of medical control by means of nitrite of amyl and other remedies. Again, the Indian Government is making experiments with the view of discovering some antidote to snake poisons, from which it is estimated that in India alone no fewer than 20,000 of Her Majesty's subjects annually perish. Let us suppose that even without experiments on living animals, by some happy accident, an antidote may be discovered 25 years hence; still, in the meantime, half-a-million of lives will have been sacrificed, an immense amount of suffering will have been caused, and many thousands of families will have been brought to misery. We must remember that even now, alas, all medical treatment, all surgical operations, still partake somewhat of the nature of an experiment. As our medical knowledge, indeed, enlarges, this character becomes less and less experimental; but until our knowledge becomes perfect, to a certain extent it must so continue. It is not, then, a question whether experiments shall be performed or not; that is a decision beyond human power to control; the real question is, whether experiments shall be performed upon animals or upon men? The Report of the Royal Commission contains a long list of experiments brought forward by the Society for the Abolition of Vivisection in support of their views. These experiments may be divided, I think, into three classes. By far the greater number were performed under anæsthetics. Against these, therefore, no tenable accusation can be brought. The second class—a very small one—contains certain experiments, undeniably painful and made without anæsthetics, but made under a deep sense of responsibility, and under the conviction that a certain amount of suffering inflicted on a small number of animals might be the means of saving a larger amount of suffering to a much greater number of animals and to those of a higher order. Those of the third class, I must say, are very trivial; such, for instance, as taking a little blood from the tail of a newt, or scraping a thin shred from the gums of a mammal—an operation similar to, if not identical with, that which we perform upon ourselves every morning of our lives. To put forward such cases as these as evidences of diabolical cruelty is really childish. A good deal has been said with reference to the cruelty of sport. For my own part, however, I do not think there is much in the *tu quoque* argument. If cruelty there be in the one, it cannot be defended merely by showing that there is cruelty in the other also. It has been said by a witty Frenchman that if an Englishman were to see an angel from Heaven his first idea would be to get a gun and shoot him. As far, indeed, as mere suffering is concerned, it cannot be denied that one day's battue will often inflict as much torture as all the physiological experiments of a year. It is not so much the animals which are killed as those which are wounded. Physiologists tell us of many cases in which hares, for instance, have been sent to them suffering from painful diseases caused by a single shot corn having been lodged in the serious cavities, thus producing acute inflammation, lasting for weeks, during which no doubt the animal must have suffered extreme pain; nor will I enlarge on the dreadful sufferings of animals which are caught in traps, and which have often been known in their torment to gnaw off the limb by which they were held fast. Still I trust I may be permitted to express a hope that one result of the strong sentiments which have grown up on this subject may be to alter the state of feeling in which men of high character, and I do not doubt, really, most kind-hearted, think it a legitimate subject of pride to boast of the greatest number of lives which they have been able to destroy in the course of a day's so-called sport; and we must remember that, while in the one case it is the death itself of these animals which is the object in view, the aim of physiologists is the relief of suffering. And now let me ask the House whether there are not two sides to this question. For months past, most sensational attacks have been made on medical men and physiologists. Thus, Miss Cobb, in a paper on the moral aspects of vivisection, states that—

> "Physiologists are indulging a maleficent tendency which already exists in their pupils' dispositions, when they invite mere lads of the Bob Sawyer type to watch their frightful experiments; the more frightful, so much, alas! the more attractive."

Mr. Hoggan, in his evidence before the Royal Commission, though he is good enough to say that, in his opinion, physiologists are not the monsters some people picture them to be, and that they do not gloat over torture, states that "their glaring fault is an entire want of feeling," and that "their feelings are entirely blunted." Mr. Jesse asserts that he could prove the existence of cruelties not surpassed by any in the history of mankind, and Sir George Duckett does not hesitate to speak of the "hellish practices" of physiologists. Such language is quite unjustifiable, still it ought not to influence us. I for one, while convinced that vivisection is in some cases justifiable, feel deeply that it ought only to be resorted to, if other methods fail, under a deep sense of responsibility, and with every precaution to avoid all unnecessary suffering. The Bill now before the House expresses the earnest desire of the country that no unnecessary suffering should be inflicted; it requires the use of anæsthetics wherever possible; and though I hope to see some improvements introduced in Committee, I shall certainly support the second reading, which will make obligatory those precautions which, as a matter of fact, are even now practically adopted. In doing so, however, I desire to say, in conclusion, for myself, and I believe I may add for not a few other hon. Members of this House, that so far from wishing to imply any condemnation of an honourable Profession, so far from considering that medical men are justly open to any imputation of callousness or of cruelty, I believe that their earnest desire, as, indeed, it is the very object of their lives, is to mitigate suffering and to diminish pain.

Mr. HOLT*: Sir, I have taken great interest in the question now before the House and have been permitted to introduce a Bill on the subject. It would not be in Order to discuss on this occasion the provisions of my Bill. I will only say that my proposals aim at a general amendment of the law of cruelty to animals, and a special prohibition of painful experiments in scientific investigation. It is my conviction that we cannot effectually deal with this question in any other way. That being so, it will not be surprising to the House if I have but little to say in favour of the Bill of the Government. I find myself in a difficult and somewhat painful position with reference to it. The Bill comes to us recommended by my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary in whose integrity of purpose and humanity of feeling I have great confidence; who deserves my thanks, and the thanks of those who oppose vivisection, and a frank acknowledgment of our obligations to him for taking up the subject, and attempting to grapple with its difficulties. On the one hand, with the Preamble of the Bill and its 1st clause I find no fault. They recognize a principle which I warmly approve, the principle that cruelty in the pursuit of science is as detestable, as much to be condemned, as cruelty in any other form:—a principle which I hope the House will not hesitate to affirm. But, Sir, on the other hand, I cannot approve the manner in which my right hon. Friend proposes to effect his object. I regard the provisions of the Bill as at variance with the spirit and principle of the Preamble, and am compelled to express, in the strongest terms, my objection to this mode of dealing with the question of vivisection. I must also express my regret that the Bill has been left to the last days of the Session. There is not time for full discussion. Were I to attempt to address myself to the whole question, or to follow the arguments employed by the hon. Member for Galway (Dr. Ward) and the hon. Member for Maidstone (Sir John Lubbock), I should occupy an amount of time, for which I cannot ask, at this period of the Session. My endeavour shall be to explain to the House my own position, and to keep my remarks as closely as possible to the Bill under consideration. That my position may be fully understood, I wish to say that I look upon this as a moral question, and therefore one that does not admit of compromise; and that, if I am asked to accept an incomplete measure with reference to it, such a measure must be based on cleared and definite principles, in harmony with the moral view of the case. Now, Sir, I do not say that all infliction of pain is cruelty; but I do maintain that all unauthorized infliction of pain is cruelty. When we take up this subject as a moral question, we have not merely to ask ourselves what suits our own convenience, or hurts our feelings, but, what are the terms on which the Creator has placed the animal world in our power. Has He assigned any limits to, or imposed any conditions upon the exercise of that power? When my right hon. Friend speaks of holding the balance between contending parties, he must permit me to remind him that, from our point of view, it is not a question in which a balance has to be struck between conflicting opinions, but one in which a decision has to be formed between right and wrong; he has not to hold a balance between sentiment and science, but to make his decision as I maintain, notwithstanding the observations of the hon. Member for Galway (Dr. Ward), between the principle of humanity and the spirit of cruelty. And when my right hon. Friend speaks of the results as justifying the practices, I ask him how far he is prepared to extent that principle in legislation? Is he prepared to admit a plea on the part of a pickpocket, that the contents of the purse which he stole saved his family from starvation, and therefore justified his act in taking it? My objection to the details of this Bill is that science is set above humanity. The Preamble admits that humanity has claims to be heard against science:—The Bill provides a system of licences and certificates under which the Secretary of State is authorized to legalize cruelty in the pursuit of science. What the Bill gives with one hand it takes away with the other. It recognizes that cruelty is possible—nay, I may say probable, in scientific experiments on animals, and provides licences to place physiologists under certain restrictions; and then it actually proceeds to provide a system of certificates to release them from those restrictions. I contend that this system of licences and certificates will prove no adequate security against cruelty. Is my right hon. Friend prepared to undertake to sit in judgment on the theories and proposals of scientific men? Is he prepared to say that this or that theory shall not be tested by experiment? When I know that he is already over-worked with the business of his Department I am convinced that he cannot undertake this additional labour, and that he must rely upon the opinions of the scientific men whom he may consult. He has told us that he proposes to amend the Bill, by introducing a provision requiring a certificate from one of the learned bodies enumerated in Clause 11, before he issues a licence: and I maintain that when that certificate has been given, my right hon. Friend will have very little option. He will feel bound to issue his licence: yet, Sir, what security has he for the soundness of judgment or humanity of feeling of the learned body which is to be authorized to issue the certificate? When I turn to the Report of the Royal Commission I find that eminence in physiology is no guarantee against inhumanity. Page 17—"It is not to be doubted that inhumanity may be found in persons of very high position as physiologists." And when I read the evidence given before the Commission I find that the scientific witnesses act upon principles which enable them to claim for themselves, and require them to extend to other experimenters, the very widest latitude in their practice. Further, on what ground can the Secretary of State suspend a certificate? If he question the decision of one of these learned bodies, they will tell him that there are grave scientific reasons which justify the experiment which he questions, that the blame must rest with him if he retard the progress of science, and hinder discoveries calculated to mitigate human suffering. Unless my right hon. Friend is prepared to set at nought the scientific world he cannot help himself. You may tell me he will have his Inspectors through whom he can regulate experiments. I should like to know what the value of this inspection will be. I am told that inspection under the anatomy Act is a sham. I fear this will be a sham. If the Inspector be a physiologist, even if he do his duty, he will see no abuse and no cruelty; if he be a layman, and venture to report to the Secretary of State some instance of cruelty, the experimenter will at once allege that the Inspector is no competent judge as to cruelty in scientific investigations. He will maintain that there is a great scientific purpose to be served in which the infliction of pain is inevitable; that a licence and certificate have been provided by Act of Parliament for the very purpose that pain may be inflicted with impunity, under the protection of the law. And he will add that no man except the operator can judge of the amount of pain which is necessary to render the experiment perfect. Now, Sir, these are no imaginary arguments. I have made use of terms and opinions taken from the evidence given before the Royal Commission by scientific witnesses, and I ask how is my right hon. Friend to judge in such a case? I believe the grossest cruelties will never come to his ears, but if they do will he not be placed in a great difficulty? He will feel that to suspend the certificate and withdraw the licence will affix a stigma to the character, possibly, of an eminent man, which he will be loth to do. He will be told that the charges are exaggerated and cannot be proved, and what can he do? My fear is that the Bill will prove practically inoperative; and I desire to express the strongest objection to a system of licences and certificates the practical effect of which will be to legalize cruelty in this country. It may be the opinion of some hon. Members that my remarks would be more properly made in Committee. Under ordinary circumstances I should place Amendments on the Paper, and discuss them in Committee; but when I observe that Amendments to meet my views of the case would be so numerous as to amount almost to a remodelling of the Bill; when I observe, considering the period of the Session at which we have arrived, that they could not be fully discussed, nor the sense of the House fairly ascertained, I am induced to abstain from any such course in deference to the opinion of those more experienced than myself, and to cast entirely on my right hon. Friend all responsibility as to details. I wish, however, plainly to say, that I cannot regard this measure as in any sense a settlement of the question—not even a temporary settlement of the question. There must be no mistake as to any supposed compromise in the matter. No compromise has been offered to the opponents of vivisection: all the concessions made have been made to the doctors, all the alterations made tend to secure advantages for physiologists, and every one of them has, in my opinion, made the Bill worse than it was before. But no doubt my right hon. Friend will say that the Bill is based on the Report of the Royal Commission. I therefore ask leave to state the reasons, or some of them, why we cannot accept the conclusions of the Report. In so doing I desire to speak with all respect of the Commission. I should be very sorry to bring against any one of the Commissioners a charge of intentional partiality; but when I know that two eminent physiologists who are favourable to vivisection were on the Commission, and that there was on the Commission no professional man competent to discuss the question with them, I cannot feel any surprise that the Report should be tinged with a vivisectional colour; indeed, I am rather surprised that it is not more so. I imagine the lay influence must have kept the phyisologists in check. My first objection to the Report is that, in my opinion, it is founded on a fallacy. It assumes that which requires to be proved. Both the witnesses in their evidence, and the Commission in their Report, assume that there is a necessity for vivisection. We are not prepared to admit this; to assume it begs the whole question. I submit that if the evidence be fairly examined it may be shown that there is (1) no insuperable necessity for the practice of vivisection, and (2) that there exist sufficient reasons why on moral, social, and even scientific grounds the practice should not only be discouraged but prohibited. The moral sense of the country has been shocked by the details which have been published; and the more people see and hear of them the more convinced they are of the difficulty of dealing with the subject except by prohibiting it altogether. I have a further objection to the Report. It seems to me that it has a bias—I do not say an intentional bias—but none the less a decided bias, in favour of the physiologists. I will endeavour to prove this:—One of the great authorities which the Commissioners quote in favour of vivisection—indeed the authority, as I understand it, which they adduce to establish its necessity—is Haller. He was the great physiologist of the last century; and on page 9 they give us an extract from his writings. But I ask why is there no reference to Dr. Rolleston's evidence in connection with this extract from Haller's writings? He had told the Commission that . . .

> "The famous Haller did at one time practice vivisections, in his own words *supra fidem certè numerosas:* . . . as he grew older he grew more sensitive to the infliction of pain; and, as is stated by Krug, Haller fell in his later age into a permanent anguish of conscience, which is shown in his epistles, reproaching himself most bitterly for his vivisections. . . . I should wish to state that Haller was by no means in his dotage at that time, quite the reverse." (1290.)

There is also a passage in the evidence of Sir William Fergusson, containing a similar sentiment. He says, in answer to the Question—

> "Did I rightly understand from you just now that your own opinion in mature life was much less favourable to these experiments than it was when you were young?—Yes, because I had not the same grasp of the subject at that time. I was more perhaps influenced by what other people had done, and by the wish to come up to what they had done in regard to such matters, but the more matured judgment of recent years has led me to say to myself now that I would not perform some of the operations at this present time that I performed myself in earlier days." (1031.)

From this I draw the inference that the cultivation of the moral sense and the growth of experience, do not dispose men to favour the practice of vivisection, but rather to regard it with disfavour. When eminent physiologists grow old, they reproach themselves for their practices, and affirm that vivisection "has not been of that immense value to human nature that some claim for it." (1015.) Would a remark to that effect have been out of place in the Report? Has not the fact an important bearing on its conclusions? Then I take another case. As an instance of the advantages derived from vivisection, the Report brings prominently forward that of the discovery of the circulation of the blood by Harvey. This is the great instance of the value of vivisection, which the physiologists are perpetually quoting in proof of their views. In the Report it is stated as an absolute certainty, that the circulation of the blood was discovered by vivisection. I ask, why is the evidence of Dr. Acland on this point wholly overlooked? Dr. Acland is a man of position and learning. He says, in answer to a Question on that subject—

> "It is not quite certain what argumentation led Harvey to that, whether it was the observation of the living structure or the contemplation of the dead structure." (991.)

Why, again, is no reference made to the circumstance, given in evidence by Dr. Sharpey (394) and Mr. Turner (3025), that it was Malpighi who really established the doctrine in question, by means of the microscope? If I understand the evidence aright, there was a link wanting in the chain, which Harvey, notwithstanding his great attainments, could not supply: that vivisection failed to achieve the discovery, and that it is in truth due to anatomy and the microscope. Let me correct that somewhat—for I have no wish to hide the fact given in Mr. Turner's evidence, that Malpighi was a vivisector, and that his observations with the microscope were made on the lungs of a frog—but on turning to Dr. Acland's evidence I find that the foot of a frog under the microscope is sufficient for the purpose; and I say that the evidence proves that the great discovery of the circulation of the blood might have been obtained without vivisection, by means of anatomy and the microscope. This, however, is not noticed in the Report. To take another instance of apparent bias in favour of vivisectors—the Report in page 10 seeks to establish the humanity of physiologists. It refers to a passage in Dr. Sharpey's evidence—that he was "utterly repelled" as a young man by Majendie's experiments in Paris, and that he does not now hesitate to speak of one of them as his "infamous" experiment. Now, Sir, I would gladly give Dr. Sharpey all the credit he deserves for his humane feelings; but when the Royal Commissioners hold him up as an example of humanity, I ask why no reference is made to the opinions expressed by him in answer to Questions (576) and (581)? He says—

> "I think, for a great scientific end, I should justify it (a lingering, painful experiment) provided you could show that it was a great scientific end" . . . and "who is competent to inspect and say what is a scientific result or not? You must trust to the persons that you permit to make these experiments?"

If I understand that aright, there are principles laid down which go far to justify all that Majendie ever did. Dr. Sharpey's humanity seems to consist in sparing his own feelings. True humanity surely regards the feelings of the sufferer, not of the spectator. The examination of Mr. Lewes confirms this view of the humanity of physiologists. He does not propose to interfere with the practice of vivisectors; but he says, "I could not bear to experiment on dogs and cats." I do not understand the reason to be that they would suffer pain: it would be painful to him: others may experiment, and if he do not see it, he has no objection. Is that humanity? Sir, it is this spurious humanity—this hard-hearted humanity, which we dread in a medical man. So long as his own feelings are not touched, he sees no pain, no abuse. We dread the application of that principle of action to the human subject;—that the sufferings of the patient are to be of no consideration compared with the success of the operation, the reputation of the operator, and the advancement of science;—that all to be considered is the feeling of the bystanders, and the possible indignation of the public. And, let me ask, how do these gentlemen really differ from Dr. Klein? The hon. Member for Galway spoke of Dr. Klein as having been rather hardly treated. I agree with him. I do not sympathize with Dr. Klein's opinions, but I believe he honestly spoke the truth. He knew enough of the English language to speak the truth: possibly not enough to veil his meaning under a cloud of ambiguous words. He said that the consequences to be considered were those which concerned himself; not those which concerned animals: and that English physiologists took the same view. I think I have already shown that Dr. Klein is correct in that particular. But how does this bear on the question of anæsthetics? Is there not reason to think that if the physiologist has no fear of being bitten or scratched, he will be careless as to the administration of an anæsthetic? It appears to me to establish the opinion of Dr. Haughton. He was examined on this point, to the following effect:—

> "You stated that you had no confidence in a mere regulation that experiments should be performed under anæsthetics. Could you give us any further reasons why you think that? I need not tell you that it is a most important part of the matter — well, that is notorious amongst physiologists. Unless the thing be inspected, I would not trust to it that complete anæsthesia would be produced. I would not trust the enthusiast who is dissecting to keep it up always as long as it was needed." (1892.)
>
> "We have heard that he would be likely to do it for the sake of the operation itself because he would perform it with much greater ease under anæsthesia? If it would facilitate his operation it would, of course, always be used by him, but not always if it would not facilitate it." (1893.)
>
> "You would not approve of its being taken out of the operation of the criminal Acts against cruelty if anæsthesia was used?—Most certainly not, because I know the practice is to use the anæsthesia very imperfectly, and when the controlling eye is gone to drop the use of it altogether." (1884.)

Does not this render the recommendation in the Report, as to the use of anæsthetics, of doubtful value? Does it not add force to the opinion expressed by Sir William Fergusson?—

> "I think there is a great weakness on the part of those who try to make it appear that vivisection on the lower animals may now be more readily done than it could be before because an experiment at the time of an animal being insensible is really of little or no value." (1080.)

All this confirms my belief in the accuracy of the opinion expressed by a well-known physiologist (Dr. Hoggan) that anæsthetics are rather a curse than a blessing to the lower creatures, because they tend to lull public feeling towards vivisectors rather than pain in the vivisected. Again, on page 13 of the Report, I find the opinion of Sir James Paget is quoted on the subject of snake poison in India. Sir James is of opinion that it will be impossible to discover an antidote without experiments on animals. It seems to me worthy of note, that no reference is made to the opinion of Dr. Swaine Taylor on this subject, as given in answer to Question 1205. Dr. Taylor is a great authority on poisons, and his opinion may surely be considered as of some weight. Dr. Taylor was expressly questioned upon this subject. He was informed as to Sir James Paget's opinion, and was asked to say whether he agreed with it. The reply was "I do not." Yet the Report does not refer to this opinion expressed by Dr. Taylor. On page 15, I find that Sir James Paget's opinion is again quoted, with reference to legislative interference with vivisection. He advocates the establishment of a medical council to authorize experiments; being of opinion that though one man might do something unreasonable or unnecessary, the joint opinion of three or four members of the Medical Profession would be a guarantee against such abuses. Now, Sir, this bears on the Bill under consideration. The idea of Sir James Paget is in some sort adopted in Clause 11. I ask, why is there no reference in the Report to the fact given in evidence by Professor Haughton?—

> "The recent trial at Norwich has established the fact that in a public medical congress and sanctioned by a majority of the members, an experiment was tried which has since been formally pronounced by two of the most eminent surgeons in the kingdom to have been 'cruel and unnecessary.'" (1867.)

Has this no bearing on the recommendation of the Royal Commission? Once more, on page 16, Dr. Rutherford is brought forward as an authority for experiments without anæsthetics, in lectures to students. He says that it is important to exhibit to a class the action of strychnine. When the Commission quote Dr. Rutherford, why do they not also quote Dr. Taylor? Is not he an equally good authority? What does he say?—

> "With regard to strychnine I think in some of the evidence already before us it has been said that it is important that medical practitioners, when they are students, should see the operation of strychnine upon animals to see how it causes death. Is that your opinion?—I really do not consider it absolutely necessary. (1218.) . . . There is something very dreadful in the operation of strychnine upon an animal; no doubt it suffers agonizing pain." (1219.)
>
> "In your judgment at the present day are the symptoms of poisoning by strychnine so well established that it is unnecessary to show students the operation itself, in order to enable them to see what the effect of strychnine is?—I think it quite unnecessary." (1222.) . . . . "There really is no point to be gained by poisoning an animal with strychnine; we gain nothing by it, and in my opinion it is a cruel experiment." (1179.)

There is one other instance which, in my opinion, affords proof of a bias in the Report in favour of vivisection, to which I must refer. There was given in evidence a remarkable opinion by the late Sir Charles Bell with reference to the value of vivisection. No notice is taken of it in the Report. Sir Charles Bell is reported to have said or written (see *The Times*, August 13th, 1863, quoted by Mr. Colam in his evidence)—

> "Experiments (vivisections) have never been the means of discovery; and the survey of what has been done of late years will prove that the opening of living animals has done more to perpetuate error, than to enforce the just views taken from anatomy and the natural motions."

But Sir, so far as I am aware, there was no searching cross-examination of anybody, to ascertain when this opinion was given—under what circumstances and how it was given, what is the authority for it and the value of it. Sir Charles Bell was a great physiologist. The Report does not mention his opinion. Haller is quoted—Harvey is quoted—not Bell. Is it surprising, with this tendency to ignore the evidence of witnesses unfavourable to vivisection, that we should be unable to accept the conclusions and recommendations of the Commission? I say, Sir, that this Bill, based on the Report of the Royal Commission, will not satisfy the country. I know that if we pass this Bill the disappointment of many persons will be very great: they would rather have no Bill at all. The vast majority of those who have petitioned this House on the subject are in favour of the total prohibition of vivisection. A Return has been recently laid on the Table, showing that the number of petitioners, asking for prohibition, is 146,889, whilst only 1,520 ask for restriction to be placed on the practice. I ask, what will be the practical effect of this Bill if it pass into law? Will not Dr. Ferrier continue to slice away the brains of his unfortunate monkeys, bit by bit—and under a certificate—I presume he will have one, if he choose—without anæsthetics, even in the presence of the Inspector; and to apply his electrodes to the tenderest parts of the body of his miserable victim? ["Oh!"] Have hon. Members read the accounts given in evidence of the proceedings of Dr. Ferrier? ["Oh!"] It may be disagreeable; it is very painful to read and to hear these details — but I must refer to them. I quote from "Proceedings of the Royal Society." (Page 276 of the Report of the Royal Commission.)—

> "The ganglia were subjected to experimentation in the following seven cases . . . . VI. In this case irritation of the right anterior tubercle (nates) caused intense dilation of both pupils—especially beginning in the left—elevation of the eyebrows, and turning of the eyeballs upward and to the left, at the same time that the head was turned in the same direction, with an intensely pathetic expression. Momentary application of the electrodes to the posterior tubercles (testes) caused the animal to bark loudly, the sound passing with longer stimulation into every conceivable variation of howling and screaming. . . . XII. . . . when the animal was nearly dead, irritation of the testes caused only powerful retraction of the angles of the mouth, so as to shew the firmly clenched teeth."

Sir, I read that account with disgust and indignation. I know they say these experiments were performed under anæsthetics, and would make it appear that the animal suffers no more than the wires of a pianoforte. They will not persuade the public of that. The impression will prevail that there was at any rate imperfect narcosis: and people will not forget Dr. Ferrier's evidence, when they observe his experiments. He said (3245)—

> "I should say . . . . that where the administration of an anæsthetic would prejudice the object for which the experiment was conceived, then the experiment is still justifiable, notwithstanding the fact that it might inflict a certain amount of pain on the animal."

I repeat that I read the account of these experiments with disgust and indignation. They manifest, in my opinion, a refinement of cruelty, to be punished, not to be protected, by law. They manifest a refinement of cruelty which renders the operator, in my opinion, quite unfit to be trusted with the care of an animal, much less of a human being. When it comes to the knowledge of the public that these are the practices of a medical man who has free access to the lunatic asylums of the West Riding, public indignation will know no bounds. I wish to know from my right hon. Friend whether he considers that the published accounts of Dr. Ferrier's proceedings disqualify him from holding a licence or a certificate under this Bill? If not, it may well be regarded as a Physiologist's Protection Bill. Dr. Sibson, in like manner, under the theory that "there is very little suffering inflicted" in baking, freezing, or "carefully starving" (they are his own words) animals, may, if he chooses, practice these experiments, which are in his estimation "the reverse of painful." (4745. 4749.) Dr. Rutherford, under this Bill, may go on with his biliary fistula, and subject not 40 but 100 dogs, if he likes, to protracted pain, of which Dr. McKendrick tells us that it is "very considerable." Dr. Legg may gratify his scientific crotchets on an unnumbered series of wretched cats left to pine away in misery—and all with impunity, under the protection of the law! When all this is understood; when it is understood that the Secretary of State can only withdraw a licence in extreme cases and that the secrets of the torture-chambers will rarely reach his ears; when the public read the Blue Book, and the details of the horrible practices come to be known; when they understand that in registered places, and by licensed persons, these practices may be pursued with impunity, I do not doubt the result. England will ring from one end to the other with the cry that they shall be stopped. I cannot believe that

Englishmen will ever permit cruelty to be perpetrated in the name of science. I regret, Sir, that the doctors have taken up the subject in the way in which they have done; that the leaders of the Profession have identified themselves with the practice of vivisection. They think they have great power, it is true. I admit that their influence is very powerful; but there are things more powerful than the influence of the doctors, and one of them is, that English feeling which has been outraged. I cannot believe that Englishmen will suffer cruelty to be veiled under the guise of science, or will tolerate, in England, in the nineteenth century, practices worthy only of the dark ages.

Mr. LOWE said, that the question before the House was whether they should read that Bill the second time or not, and that depended on the provisions of the Bill itself and on the character of the persons who were to be affected by them. As to the provisions of the Bill itself, the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department had gained rather more advantage than he was entitled to by the very conciliatory manner in which he had opened that discussion, because no doubt he had persuaded hon. Members who had not looked carefully into the matter, that the Bill was exceedingly mild and gentle; that it was a Bill to which no reasonable person would object, and one from which the sting had been taken by the suggestions that he had made, and that therefore the House ought to accept it as a satisfactory settlement of the question. Now, for himself, he was sorry to say that, with every wish to meet the right hon. Gentleman half-way, his opinion on that matter would not allow him to do so. He regarded that measure as a very harsh and severe measure, and thought its harshness and severity were aggravated by the character of the people against whom—and against whom alone —it was directed. It began by declaring an entirely new offence—namely, that of performing on an animal any experiment calculated to give pain. The House was probably aware that no punishment by the law of England was attached to the moral offence of giving pain, and therefore the present Bill was an attempt to make a new criminal offence. Having commenced by this rather strong measure, the Bill went on to set out seven different things that must be done in order to avoid the penalties it imposed. In addition to that there were four different means by way of certificate by which a person could obtain a relaxation of the seven different things with which they were called upon to comply. Very great powers were vested in the Secretary of State, and no experiment could be performed except upon licensed premises. The language of the Bill was such as to lead to the supposition that the persons against whom it was directed were persons engaged in a disreputable or doubtful trade, who were unworthy of trust and had wicked propensities, and against whom the most stringent precautions had to be taken. There was no precedent for any Bill of this kind except by that furnished by measures directed against persons who in years gone by used to be called "body-snatchers," and this fact was by no means complimentary to the Medical Profession, against whom this measure of exceptional severity was proposed to be enacted. Had the Home Secretary thought fit to incorporate in a Bill the four excellent rules laid down by the British Association, he could have entertained no objection to it. It was one thing to make the laws for putting down wicked or immoral or cruel practices, and it was another to establish a machinery of inspection and supervision which was to the last degree an insult to an educated and scientific body of men, and which imposed a stigma upon them which nothing could wash away. He objected to the Bill because it was, in his opinion, one of the most stringent and degrading character directed against the Medical Profession, telling them in so many words that they were not to be trusted to conduct experiments, and placing them in the hands of a class of officials. If wrong, he should be most happy to be corrected; but he challenged the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department to produce any precedent for the measure except in the case of those directed against persons labouring under the gravest suspicion. The next question was — who were the persons against whom the Bill was directed? They were the physiologists. And who were the physiologists? They were almost without exception medical men. If persons possessing no medical knowledge took upon themselves to tamper with the life or the sensations of inferior animals, he should not object to a measure being passed to put a stop to such a practice; but what he objected to was that a number of gentlemen who had received the highest medical education, who had taken degrees of the highest merit, men to whom the most precious lives and the most important secrets, involving the happiness of families, were entrusted, who often had to exercise judicial and *quasi*-judicial functions, and who, with rare exceptions, justified the confidence reposed in them, were to be subjected to supervision and restraint as though they were capable of the most cruel and wicked acts. He was surprised that any amount of popular clamour or expression of feeling on the part of ignorant persons could have induced Her Majesty's Government to introduce a measure that was so manifestly unfair and unjust as the present. While the possession of the medical degree did not, perhaps, insure, it gave sound and reasonable ground for believing that men who had passed severe examinations, and who had proved themselves to be of competent skill could be trusted in matters of this kind without their being fettered by the restrictions now proposed to be imposed upon them. If there were any doubt upon the point he need only appeal to the Report of the Commission to remove it. Although he was unable to agree in the recommendations of that Commission, yet he must say that their Report bore the most ample testimony to the humanity and the good feeling of the Medical Profession and also to that of the medical students. In these circumstances, he was entitled to ask where was the ground for this extraordinary legislation, for this inspection and reporting, for this creation of a new offence, and all the machinery contained in the Bill? What had the Medical Profession done that it should be subjected to such insulting and degrading restrictions? It might, perhaps, be said that notwithstanding their high opinion of the Medical Profession, the Commission had recommended that some stringent measure should be passed, but let the Commissioners answer that. He confessed that it certainly was inexplicable to him that, entertaining that high opinion of the Profession, they should have arrived at such a conclusion. Plato had said that the people of his Republic, being well trained up, would require but few laws; yet here were a class of educated gentlemen, admirably trained up, for whom the House of Commons was asked to legislate in the most stringent manner. Turning to another branch of the subject, he wished to point out that this Bill was drawn up without the slightest reference to the existing state of the law in England, insomuch that that law was entirely confined to domestic animals. Under the present law any person who cruelly illtreated a domestic animal was liable to a penalty of £5, or to two months' imprisonment, and that was the whole of the law on the subject of cruelty to animals in this country, with the exception of some provisions against bull-baiting, badger-drawing, and cock-fighting, which were directed rather against riotous assemblings and breaches of the peace than in favour of humanity. The law did not say a word in favour of non-domestic animals; so far as they were concerned, their charter of freedom and mercy had not yet been begun to be written in the legislation of this country. By the Bill two blacks were made a white—that was to say, the infliction of pain, which was not a crime, and the trying of an experiment, which was not a crime, when added together made a crime, and the result was that — in which it was justified—in the only case in which the suffering of animals could be entirely justified by the end in view the infliction of it was made penal. The crime created by the Bill was not the infliction of pain upon an animal, but the infliction of that pain for the purposes of experiment for the benefit of mankind. Let him put a case by way of illustration. It was said that by the infliction of torture upon a monkey, the animal in its agony could be made to make the most extraordinary and grotesque grimaces. Supposing a medical man, in the interests of human life, inflicted such torture upon a monkey by way of experiment, he would come within the provisions of this Bill and would be liable to punishment. But where a man for mere amusement, and to gratify a morbid curiosity, inflicted the same torture, in order to witness these grotesque grimaces, he would not come within the provisions of the Bill and would not be liable to punishment under it. Was it possible to reduce legislation to a lower depth of absurdity? The only parallel to it was the defence of the persons charged under the Act against wounding with intent to disfigure that they had wounded a man with the intent not to disfigure but to murder him. Terrible cruelties were practised in the preparation of food for man which were not punishable by law. Thus, turtles were hung by the feet with their heads downwards for 24 hours before they were killed, in order that the blood might settle in the head and the meat be white for the table, and crabs were put into cold water and were gradually boiled alive. What, then, was the course that ought to be pursued? It had been indicated in the Petition presented to that House by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh, which had been signed by upwards of 3,000 medical men, in which they urged the Government to deal with the general law of cruelty to animals, and to lay down rules which would include themselves in the event of their being guilty of wanton cruelty, but not to pass a measure that would put them, as distinct from the general community, under a peculiar stigma. He also ventured to recommend the adoption of that course to Her Majesty's Government, for he was satisfied that the benefit of the human race, and even of animals, was concerned in the advancement of physiology, and that they would be acting cruelly if they put a stop to it. He therefore trusted that they would introduce a Bill prohibiting all acts of cruelty towards inferior animals, whether domestic or non-domestic, and prevent them being subjected to any suffering at human hands at all. But even if such a measure were passed, it should contain an exception in favour of the very men against whom the present measure was directed, who should be allowed under proper restrictions to make experiments which had for their object the benefit not only of the human race but of the animals themselves. They would thus do away with all the inspection and certification, and the law would then work in the old English way—it would work itself. They would not only have then adopted an efficient way of putting down all real cruelty, but would have proclaimed the great charter of mercy to the whole creation. They would then have done far more to make it impossible that any cruelty could be practised in particular cases than if they multiplied all these small precautions so as to form the staple of the Bill. He protested against a measure of this kind, which was framed upon spurious ideas of mercy, and hoped that the House would not allow it to pass, at all events, in its present shape.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM, in opposing the Bill, said, he wished to point out that, even if the number of gentlemen who would be affected by this Bill was only 12 or 20 it was none the less incumbent upon the House to see that justice was done them irrespective of any clamour which might have arisen on this subject out-of-doors. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had just alluded to the Report of the Commission, and it appeared that by the adoption of a very unusual course the Government measure went far beyond the recommendations which that Report contained. It was quite evident that the Government, doubtless owing to pressure that had been brought to bear upon them from influential quarters, had intended at one time to make this measure even more stringent than it was at present, and he had seen with considerable satisfaction the Amendments proposed by the Government as an indication of their intention to somewhat retrace their steps in that direction. Those who advocated these restrictions being placed upon medical men, on the ground that to authorize vivisection was to legalize cruelty, should not forget that the laws of nature in connection with animal life were all cruel, and therefore everything which was done as regarded it must necessarily be connected with torture. But the motive with which these experiments were undertaken more than palliated—entirely removed — any cruelty which might be supposed to attend them; and, in his opinion, it was perfectly astounding that men who spent their lives and their fortunes in inflicting death and pain in some shape or another on the inferior animals, as a matter of sport, should have taken an active part in the agitation in favour of this Bill. He objected to the Bill on three grounds—first, that it proposed to enact that places should be registered for the purpose of experiments instead of licences being given to individuals to conduct them; secondly, that it authorized the appointment of Inspectors by the Home Secretary; and thirdly, that it exempted dogs and cats from experiments. In his opinion, there should be no exemptions in a Bill of this character.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR: Sir, there are two Bills relating to vivisection before this House. The Government Bill admits its necessity, but regulates its practice so as to prevent or diminish animal suffering. The Bill of the hon. Member for Lancaster (Mr. Holt) is of much wider scope, both in what it prevents and admits. It wholly prohibits physiologists from making experiments on living animals; but it proposes to give the sanction of the law (I think for the first time) to all those cruel cuttings and mutilations which man performs on domestic animals to make them of more use to him. Now, these two Bills fairly represent the phases of public feeling on this subject. The thorough prohibition of scientific vivisection is aimed at the practices of about a dozen physiologists all through the Kingdom, although not one instance of cruelty has been established against them during the three years' agitation of the subject. And the same Bill throws a legal mantle of protection around the thousands of our countrymen who hunt, who slaughter, who maim animals either for pleasure or profit. I know that the hon. Gentleman thinks he has Scriptural warranty in the grant of animals to man for food, but it is difficult to include in such a warranty the hunting of foxes or even ordinary sport. There is another Scriptural authority which tells us that we often strain at gnats and swallow camels, and the Bill to my mind rather illustrates that it

> "Compounds the sins it is inclined to,
> By damning those it has no mind to."

The Government Bill, on the other hand, settles itself on one portion of the field of cruelty and resolves to regulate that. There is this full justification for such a course, that all unavoidable animal suffering ought to be repressed. Only do not let us be under a misapprehension. We propose to regulate one minute corner of the vast field of the cruelty of the world. When we do so we are bound to survey the whole field for legislation on a future occasion. Because when our legislative conscience has been once awakened it cannot be stifled by a mere action of infinitesimal magnitude. Let us then understand that we are now occupied with the discussion of an insignificant and scarcely perceptible corner in the great field of cruelty in the world. All nature is red-handed. Animals prey upon each other and even rejoice in torture. Their very instincts are formed in the attempt of one class of animals chasing others to eat them alive, and of the latter trying to escape being caught. Man is no exception. He is an omnivorous animal, with carnivorous propensities. He chases, fishes, hunts, slaughters, with a keen zest for enjoyment. In the midst of his daily exercise of cruelty, he hears with horror that a dozen physiologists in this country inflict suffering on animals, not in the warm pursuit of the chase, but in what seems to him a cold-blooded pursuit of knowledge; and his conscience is aroused against them, but not against himself. He forgets that it is not only in the excitement of the chase that cruelty is inflicted. Agriculturists are vivisectors on a huge scale. We scarcely eat a mutton chop unless the sheep has been cruelly castrated. Cattle are treated in the same way; and even female animals, such as sows, are subjected to a severe operation when they are spayed. The very horses which we ride have been mutilated by a cruel and painful operation when young. Minor vivisections are of constant occurrence. Farmers cut off the tails of sheep, or snip out portions of the ears of animals, but no one calls them vivisectors. Cruelty in supplying us with food has hitherto not been subject to legislation, though I hope it will be as a sequel to this Bill. I know nothing more cruel than the mode of suplying rabbits to the Billingsgate market. They are caught in traps, and struggle through the whole night in cruel anguish, often with broken legs, till the keeper comes in the morning to put them out of their misery. We crimp salmon, cod, and skate, when alive. We throw lobsters into boiling water, or, what is worse, put the living lobster into cold water and gradually boil it. Now, if one of our dozen physiologists was to describe a single experiment made with such a reckless disregard of animal suffering as is daily perpetrated in preparing animals for food, he would be scouted by his brother physiologists and be driven out of the

Kingdom. Against such wholesale and wanton acts of cruelty as these no clamour has been raised. A mere ministration to the appetite of one man is thought to justify any amount of animal suffering; but the profit to the whole human race of a successful and well-devised physiological experiment is no excuse to the man of science if he inflict suffering in the pursuit of knowledge. My right hon. Friend the Home Secretary intends to modify this Bill materially, but had it passed into law in its present form, see how different would have been the position of two men in regard to cruelty. Let us take an oyster for illustration. Any man to gratify his appetite may do what he likes with a living oyster. He vivisects it when he cuts its muscular attachment to the shell; he may subject it to as intense pain as its low organization is susceptible of by covering it with vinegar and pepper. He may vivisect it in his mouth by the action of his teeth, or he may swallow it whole to be slowly killed in his stomach by the gradual action of its gastric juice, just as fishing birds do with the fish which they swallow. Now turn to the physiologist. Had this Bill become law in its present form, if my friend Dr. Sharpey, in his researches on ciliary movements, were to cut an oyster and put it under the microscope, without registering his house and receiving a certificate from the Secretary of State, this Bill would have fined him £50 or £100 pounds, or have given him three months' imprisonment. What I want the House clearly to understand is, that all the animal suffering which will be prevented when this Bill becomes law is quite microscopic when contrasted with the suffering which will continue outside its operations. Nevertheless, I fully admit that is no argument against legislation. All that it justifies me in contending is, that we must not legislate unreasonably under the influence of a sentimental panic, which arose from an imperfect acquaintance with facts, although now the Royal Commission has done much good service in putting them in their true light. There are, however, well-grounded reasons for legislation, and these operated upon me last year when I introduced a Bill on the same subject. Though the Bill was introduced by me, it was in reality prepared by very eminent physiologists, among whom I may mention Mr. Darwin, Mr. Huxley, and Dr. Burdon Sanderson, and was approved by the heads of the two Colleges in London. It is obvious, therefore, that physiologists themselves were early in the field in recognition of the necessity for legislation; and I will explain why they were so. They knew, as the Royal Commission has since told the public, that they uniformly adopted methods for preventing animal suffering or for mitigating it in the few instances in which it is inevitable, and they desired that this customary obligation should be made statutory in order to inform and relieve the public mind. It is an obvious duty of men of science to use all the means for the relief of animal suffering which their own researches have placed at their disposal. For instance, the great physician Sir James Simpson was an active experimentalist on animals. In his desire to relieve animal suffering he discovered the use of chloroform as an anæsthetic. After that discovery he, and every other physiologist, were bound to use this scientific discovery to prevent pain, especially when it was inflicted by themselves. This moral obligation was recognized by the Medical Profession, and was acted upon by physiologists. This the Royal Commission fully admits. The custom of using anæsthetics, when experiments are made on animals, is already universal in this country, and physiologists are willing to convert a customary into a statutory obligation. But this will not satisfy those who desire to abolish vivisection. There are some persons both inside and outside of this House who honestly think that experiments on animals are unjustifiable at all times, and that they never produce benefit to man. To them all the array of beneficial discoveries described in the evidence given before the Royal Commission have no meaning. They assert that even the discovery of the use of chloroform was not derived through experiments on animals, but by direct experiment of Sir James Simpson on himself and his assistant. This may be so, for he was a bold experimentalist; but I have often seen him try experiments for new anæsthetics on animals. Let me instance one of these. I drew his attention to a new etherial liquid which I thought might have anæsthetic qualities. Sir James Simpson was so struck with it that he desired at once to try it in my laboratory. I, however, refused to supply him, unless he promised me to try it first on rabbits. On administering it to them they quickly became insensible, and duly recovered. Next morning Sir James Simpson was about to inhale it himself, but on looking into the rabbit hatch he found all the animals dead. Now, the extreme anti-vivisectionists would think this an unjustifiable experiment. I do not. I think it was a small matter that the rabbits died, but a great matter that the life of my distinguished medical friend was saved, and that for years after he lived to relieve the sufferings of humanity by his experience and his discoveries. There is a considerable misapprehension in the public mind as to the term "vivisection." It does not mean that animals are cut open to see what goes on in their inside. That used to be the meaning ages ago in the infancy of physiological knowledge. Perhaps that was the method of learning anatomy in the primitive University of Alexandria, for even at a later period criminals were handed over to the surgeon to be operated on. But these practices are matters of history. The experiments now performed are on individual parts, and, with very few exceptions, are made upon an animal rendered as insensible to pain as a log of wood. Experiments are of three kinds. First, there are those which are made to acquire a further and deeper insight into the laws of life; second, those required to elicit the action of poisons or remedies; third, those performed to ascertain the nature and progress of various diseases. The simple enumeration of these purposes contains within them their justification to all reasonable minds. For if animals are properly used by man for his food, and may be hunted and slaughtered with this object, surely a few of them may be used, in a state of insensibility, to discover new knowledge which is of infinite importance for the well-being, not only of man, but also of the domestic animals with which he is brought into close relations. No argument is necessary to convince an enlightened audience of the reasonableness of this proposition. The question here before us is—Does this Bill, while putting no unwise obstructions in the way of such experiments, secure to the animals an immunity from unnecessary suffering? I do not admit, in fact I wholly deny, that there has been any indifference to animal suffering in the experiments of physiologists. But if the public conscience requires to be satisfied that no future indifference may arise, physiologists ought to be the last to resist any securities which may be taken for the prevention of cruelty. And I understand that they desire this Bill to pass, if the Amendments indicated in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department are adopted by the House. In fact, their scientific work is interrupted by an agitation, so cruel and unjust to themselves, that I believe I am right when I state that there is not a single experimental physiologist in the Kingdom who does not desire the agitation to be ended by a reasonable law, which will satisfy the public conscience that they, as physiological experimentalists, are using all the precautions of science. All the leading physiologists of the country have assured me that this is their feeling either personally or by letter. The Medical Profession at large was much dissatisfied with this Bill in its first form. The Medical Faculty of my own University did not even like the Bill which I introduced last year, and they thought this Bill, as originally introduced, was an insult to medical science. But I admit that the concessions made by the Government have materially modified the feelings of the Medical Profession. They were jealous of the honour of physiologists, who, they think, have been attacked in an unjustifiable way, and in a generous spirit of professional pride they at first desired to defeat the Bill. They felt that the charge of inhumanity which has been brought against the most humane of all Professions was one keenly to be resented. I have no title to speak for medical men generally, even although 3,500 of them have to-day asked me to present their Petition; but I can say that many of my constituents who have addressed me on the subject will be gratified by the large concessions made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who has now ranged himself on the side of humanity with the physiologists themselves, and has removed those provisions of the Bill which obstructed science and were thought to insult its followers. But I think that, after the Amendments promised by the Government, if this Bill be thrown out, agitation will largely increase, and that a reasonable Bill in the future will be attainable with more difficulty. The force of public opinion on the subject is underrated by many of my medical friends. No doubt it is an exaggerated and uninstructed public opinion, but this very fact renders it more dangerous to the progress of science. Had this Bill been what it was when first introduced, medical men would have been fully justified in continuing to give it an uncompromising opposition. But now the proposed Amendments will confine it to making statutory the very precautions against suffering which physiologists in this country have made customary. Why, then, should it be met in a spirit of opposition, if we can amend its provisions? It seems to me to be a mistake to bring physiological science into collision with public opinion, simply because that is uninstructed and does not know that what it demands as law is exactly what physiologists already do by custom. If public conscience be satisfied by a statutory security that men of science will continue to employ these precautions, there is no real objection in our concessions to a public demand. The first of the changes which I understand the right hon. Gentleman opposite consents to introduce into his Bill is to limit its operation to "warm-blooded" animals. With this definition, mammals and birds will come under the operation of the Bill; but reptiles, amphibia, and fishes will be excluded. Such an exclusion is consistent with the recent advances of physiology. For although, from the nature of the case, it is nearly impossible to demonstrate that the lower animals have complete insensibility to pain, there is strong reason for believing that cold-blooded animals have a far less sensibility than warm-blooded animals. A salmon caught with a fly pulls in a way which would be impossible to a creature of sensitive organization. In fact, if we had not some assurance of this, many of our common practices would be intolerably cruel. Thus a worm writhing on a hook, or fishes piled up in a heap to die of suffocation, would be utterly repulsive to humanity if these creatures possessed high sensibility to pain. A fisherman places a live frog on a hook to troll for pike, and could only do so on the assurance that it has not acute suffering. Mere reflex motions of an active character do not indicate pain. A sea anemone in a pool clutches and swallows its prey with the same avidity as a sentient and intelligent animal, though there is no reason to believe that it has more feeling than a sensitive plant. But this Bill, by its original terms, would have made an experiment on a sea anemone as penal as that on a cat or a dog. By it a naturalist going for a holiday to the seaside could not have experimented on a jelly fish, or on a limpet which he pulls off a rock, unless he obeyed all its provisions. This want of definition of an animal placed both the naturalist and the right hon. Gentleman in an absurd position. The right hon. Gentleman is a great official entrusted with high functions and responsibilities, but a Home Secretary as a protector of the lower forms of animal life — a great officer of State charged to protect jelly fish and limpets—is an absurdity. He has therefore done right to confine the Bill to warm-blooded animals of sensitive organization, and to trust to the physiologist that he will not exercise cruelty on any form of animal life. The evidence before the Commission shows that this is an acknowledged rule even in regard to frogs, which have much more consideration at the hands of physiologists than of fishermen. I observe, in passing, that the intended modification of the Bill in regard to prosecutions — against which the Home Secretary may issue his veto, if they are trivial and vexatious—will be as welcome to medical men as the increased trust to be reposed in them in regard to the places in which experiments may be made. The right hon. Gentleman modifies the clauses as to the power of experimenting on domestic animals, such as the cat and dog. Doubtless they are highly sensitive creatures, but both are readily placed under the influence of chloroform. If they were excluded, as originally proposed in the Bill, the most valuable results of such experiments to the benefit of man would have been lost, for the experience derived from the action of remedies and poisons on herbivorous animals is little applicable to man. A poison acts quite differently on a rabbit and on a man. A rabbit will eat belladonna without much injury, but that poison acts on dogs and cats as it does upon man. It is right that with sensitive creatures like dogs and cats, every precaution against pain should be taken; but to have prevented physiologists from experimenting upon them would have been a fatal blow to the progress of physiology. In conclusion, I think, after the statements of the right hon. Gentleman, his Bill has assumed a form which will make it more acceptable to men of science than it was when first introduced. Physiologists have always admitted in this country that they were under a moral obligation to use all the resources of science to prevent or to lessen the infliction of pain in their experiments. They also have fully admitted that such experiments should be confined to qualified and skilled persons, and that reckless, ill-considered, and purposeless experiments should be prohibited. As I understand the Bill in the light of the explanations which we have received to-day, this is now the motive and extent of the Bill which we are asked to pass. By it we will have the surety that physiological research on living animals will in the future be limited to the competent scientific investigator, who is ready to bring all the resources of science to prevent or mitigate the suffering attendant on the experiments. You will have far more security that this will be accomplished by reposing more confidence in the humane spirit of investigators than you would have had under the original stringent clauses of the Bill. For a statute cannot regulate individual motives and consciences, when these have been placed in antagonism to its provisions; but a statute which asks physiologists to co-operate with the State in preventing cruelty to animals will be obeyed with alacrity, when its chief purpose is to convert into law the humane precautions which the investigators had already imposed upon themselves by custom.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he agreed with his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) that it was desirable to put down all kinds of cruelty in the world, but the difficulty was how that was to be done. The duty the Commissioners, of whom he (Mr. Forster) was one, had to perform was simply to consider whether there was a case for stopping the suffering and pain caused by scientific experiments; and the conclusion at which he had arrived in course of the inquiry, was that the evil in question was in some degree a necessary one. To his mind, it was proved most clearly that less pain was caused by vivisection in this country than he had imagined to be the case, and he was convinced that the progress of science did to a certain extent depend upon experiments made on living animals, and that it would be wrong and foolish to attempt to put a stop absolutely to vivisection. It was clearly proved that such an endeavour would prevent discoveries in the healing art tending to save life and diminish pain both in man and the lower animals. They learnt that physiologists on the Continent inflicted a great amount of agony in the course of their experiments; and such things naturally affected the public sentiment. Unnecessary cruelty was a different thing. It was impossible to hear of experiments causing misery for hours without feeling that unless absolutely necessary they ought to be stopped; and he was glad to say that physiologists agreed with the Commissioners in the opinion that painful experiments ought not to be performed for the mere purpose of teaching, and that anæsthetics ought, whenever possible, to be resorted to. The only question, then, was whether it would be better to legislate on the subject, or to trust to the force of public opinion for the prevention of abuses. Well, he believed he was not going too far when he said that, in recommending the former course, the Commissioners carried with them the sentiment of the Medical Profession. Medical men felt that a reasonable law would to a certain extent be a protection for them, and that if the four resolutions of the British Association were passed into law there would be something very like the present Bill. It was true that a large number of them had uttered a protest, but that was against the Bill as originally drawn. For himself, he would suggest that if it was to be provided that wherever in the investigation of truth it was thought to be necessary to make a painful experiment, an exception should be made against unskilled persons, some definition ought to be given of who was a skilled and who was an unskilled person. With regard to the distinction between warm and cold-blooded animals, he did not hold quite the same view as his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair) in the definition of animals, and therefore he hoped the words "cold-blooded" would not be used. A very large proportion, amounting it was said to nine-tenths, of the experiments on animals was made on frogs; and authorities who came before him most distinctly declined to say that frogs did not feel pain. The only thing clear to his mind was that common anæsthetics had no effect on the frog, and therefore its—the frog's—position was probably worse than that of other animals. On the whole, he did not think it would be right to lay down any distinction which would exclude frogs. It was very easy to say, as an argument against the Bill, that a vast amount of cruelty was left untouched, but that was no reason why a remedy should not be provided for the particular kind of cruelty dealt with in the Bill. He hoped this would be the beginning of a new course of legislation for diminishing the amount of cruelty inflicted on the animal creation, whether domestic animals or not. Even sportsmen might in the course of time find it their duty to give up sport, or at all events to conduct it on more humane principles than they did at present. Hundreds and thousands of cases of cruelty could be shown to arise from the mere love of killing living creatures, and the simple provision—to adopt the words of the Commisioners—that sport should not be practised by "unskilled persons," or by anybody with "insufficient instruments" might alone do a great deal of good. Believing that the Bill would have a decidedly beneficial effect, he trusted Parliament would be able to pass it this Session.

Mr. DISRAELI expressed a hope that the House would allow a decision to be come to at that stage of the Bill, adding that hon. Members who wished to speak on the subject would have an opportunity of doing so on the third reading.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and committed for *To-morrow.*

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL—[*Lords*]—[Bill 221.]

(*Viscount Sandon.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Viscount Sandon*)

Mr. BARING was proceeding to call attention to its provisions, when—

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 10*th August,* 1876.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment* (218); Legal Practitioners* (220); Suez Canal (Shares)* (221); War Department and Post Office (Remuneration, &c.)* (219).

Second Reading—Municipal Privileges (Ireland) (211); Police (Expenses) Act Continuance* (212); Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment (Dublin)* (213); Forfeiture Relief (210).

Committee—Elementary Education (204-226); Pollution of Rivers* (207-227).

Third Reading—Cattle Disease (Ireland)* (195); Erne Lough and River* (189); Ardglass Harbour* (193); Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans)* (190); Exhausted Parish Lands* (186); Tralee Savings Bank* (202), and *passed.*

MUNICIPAL PRIVILEGES (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 211.)

(*The Lord Waveney.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Lord WAVENEY, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that a Bill dealing with the same subject was introduced into their Lordships' House in the year 1874. That Bill, however, was rejected. The objects of the Bill of 1874 were larger than the present Bill, and, besides dealing with the appointment of sheriffs, dealt with the question of clerks of the peace. The present Bill had passed through the other House with the assent of all parties, and its object was to give to the municipalities of Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Kilkenny, and Drogheda, which were counties in themselves, the right of appointing sheriffs, now enjoyed by such corporations in England. Care had been taken to eliminate from this Bill the features which had excited suspicion and disapproval among their Lordships in a similar measure. For example, instead of giving to the six municipalities the sole right of appointing a sheriff, they were merely to select three qualified persons, one of whom would be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. Another point which this Bill dealt with was the jury panels. The sheriff now had the power of partially appointing the jury, and this measure now proposed to do away with that power. It was further provided that the office of sheriff should not be deemed one of profit, and that no person should be disqualified from being elected an alderman or a councillor of the borough by reason of his having been appointed sheriff, nor should any person be disqualified from being sheriff by reason of his being an alderman or councillor. Another provision in the Bill would enable corporations in Ireland to grant the honorary freedom of their boroughs. At present they could not confer this honour, but there seemed no valid reason why they should be subject to this disability. For reasons also which their Lordships would understand, Clause 10 of the Bill provided that no person who had been convicted of felony should be capable of being elected to the rank of honorary burgess. The advantages of the Bill were so manifest that he had little doubt it would receive favourable consideration at the hands of their Lordships, and therefore he moved with full confidence the second reading of the measure.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord Waveney.*)

The Earl of LIMERICK, in moving, as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time that day month, said, he was intimately acquainted with one of the cities in Ireland affected by the Bill, and he must say that, after making careful inquiries, he had not found that there was any great anxiety felt about this Bill. Nor was he aware that any Petitions had been presented to their Lordships in favour of the Bill. He admitted that, to some extent, this measure was an improvement on the Bill of 1874—namely, that the clerks of the peace were not included in it. But some of the other provisions rendered it more objectionable than the other Bill was. His noble Friend opposite had not in any way attempted to state that the election of sheriffs by town councils would be good in itself, but simply advocated it because he said it existed in some towns in England, and therefore he thought it ought to exist in Ireland. Now, he thought that nobody would urge more strongly that the circumstances of England and Ireland were not exactly similar than the hon. Gentleman (Mr. M. Brooks) who introduced this Bill in "another place." He must say that he thought the election of sheriffs by municipal corporations would add considerably to the difficulties which already existed. He feared that persons would not be chosen because of their personal fitness to discharge the duties of the office, but that they would be chosen to carry out the law for having sailed very near the wind in a political sense. With regard to the city with which he was most acquainted, he could not feel any confidence that the elections would be conducted in a manner that would add to the dignity of the city. He remembered an election in which the room in which the town council met was occupied by a furious mob, and a town councillor in a sworn examination said he was unable to exercise his vote, because his life would have been in danger if he had done so, and he believed that this case was not a solitary instance. He could not believe that a Bill of this description would tend to promote the dignity of the sheriffs. He knew it would be said that this Bill differed from the previous Bill, inasmuch as that the corporations were not to elect the sheriffs, but were to recommend three persons to the Lord Lieutenant for election. He must call the attention of his noble Friend opposite to this, because it appeared to him that the title of the Bill was at variance with the Preamble. The title said that it was a Bill to extend to the municipal corporations of Ireland the same privileges as those enjoyed by corporations in England. Now, he knew of no case in England in which a corporation or any other body had to recommend three persons for an office, as was proposed by this measure. He considered such a provision to be mischievous, and more mischievous than any other provision in the original Bill, because it would be perfectly competent to select two men of straw who would fulfil the requirements, and a third person who might be most objectionable. In such a case the Lord Lieutenant would naturally have to elect the objectionable person, and it would appear to the world as if the Lord Lieutenant had selected out of the three candidates the person who might be most objectionable. He should like to ask his noble Friend opposite why two cities, which he believed were also counties, had been omitted from the Bill—namely, Carrickfergus and Galway? Besides all the objections he had named, he should most strongly appeal to Her Majesty's Government, and the noble Duke who was Leader of that House (the Duke of Richmond), whether it was right that a Bill which was objected to, and rejected on a division by their Lordships the year before last, should be read a second time on the 10th of August, when, if all they heard was true, the sitting of Parliament would end on Wednesday next. He hoped their Lordships would not assent to the second reading of the measure.

Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day month".)—(*The Earl of Limerick.*)

Earl SPENCER said, the noble Lord complained that the Bill came on for second reading at so late a period of the Session. It was true that his noble Friend behind him (Lord Waveney) had reproved the Government for reading another Bill a second time at so late a period of the Session; but he hardly thought that the noble Lord who had just sat down could compare that Bill with the present measure. The Bill which was now before their Lordships was one which had been debated in that House before, and there could be no difficulty in carrying a simple measure like this even at this late period of the Session. He thought they ought to consider that this measure had excited considerable interest in Ireland, and had also attracted considerable attention "elsewhere," and he therefore thought that some slight discussion should take place on it. He desired to put before their Lordships the reasons why he should not follow the noble Earl into the Lobby on his Motion for the rejection of the Bill. He said that whenever they found a grievance was felt by a particular law, and whenever they found that by altering that law they were not in any way endangering the State, then he thought it was right to assimilate the laws of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Then he thought that all those requirements were to be found in the Bill now before their Lordships. In England they found a very considerable number, he thought as many as 20 corporate towns which had the ancient privilege of electing their own sheriffs. Some of those towns were very small; but when they went across the Channel they found larger and more important towns which had that privilege taken away from them; and, further than that, they knew that it was considered to be a great grievance by those municipalities across the Channel that those ancient privileges had been taken away from them. There would not possibly be any danger to the State in carrying this small measure. The sheriff's office in Ireland was an office of dignity. An Act had been passed this year—he meant the Juries Act—which would now become the law of the country, and he felt sure it would do great good in Ireland by removing the impression which existed in the minds of many persons as to partiality in the election of juries. No doubt, the sheriffs had the power of partially selecting the juries; but this Bill would take away that power altogether. This Bill was introduced into the other House in 1874, and after a discussion was referred to a Select Committee, and it came out from that Committee with some Amendments. On that Committee were the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), his Colleague, the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Lord Carlingford), and the present Lord Chancellor of Ireland (Dr. Ball), and he thought their Lordships would incur a serious responsibility if they rejected a measure approved of by such distinguished persons. The noble Earl opposite had asked why Carrickfergus and Galway were not included in the Bill? He believed the simple reason was, that they were not corporate towns. He hoped the Bill would be read a second time.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that, although the Bill came before the House at a very late period of the Session, the question with which it dealt was a very simple one. It was introduced by a private Member in the other House, and as such was opposed by the Government, but after undergoing a considerable amount of modification they were able to accept it. The Bill in its then form contained the principles which were recommended and adopted by Parliament in 1838-9 for the assimilation of the laws of England and Ireland on the subject, and the Government were prepared to support it in that, as they had done in the other House. He must add that he thought there was some ground for the objection that it was not altogether in accordance with its present title and Preamble, and he would, therefore, suggest that those should be altered.

LORD REDESDALE said, it was at least unfortunate that the Bill should have come up to their Lordships' House at so late a period of the Session, when there was hardly an Irish Peer present.

On Question, "That 'now' stand part of the Motion?" Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 41; Not-Contents 14: Majority 27.

Resolved in the *Affirmative*.

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

(*The Lord President.*)

(NO. 204.) COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 to 3, inclusive, *agreed to*, with Amendments.

Clause 4 (Declaration of duty of parent to educate child).

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY moved, as an Amendment, in page 1, line 11, to leave out ("the duty of,") and insert ("obligatory for"), and in line 13 to leave out ("perform such duty") and insert ("fulfil such obligation"), because duty was the highest word in the English language, and applied only to obligations imposed by Divine law and conscience. Parliament could not create duties; it might impose obligations, and it would become the duty of the subject to obey the law. Those who objected to compulsory education would not be better pleased at being told that the teaching of writing and arithmetic was a duty.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON objected to the Amendment.

Amendment *negatived*.

Clause *agreed to*.

Clause 5 (Regulation as to employment of child under ten, and certificate of education or previous school attendance being condition of employment of child over ten).

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON submitted that the operation of the clause, as regarded the personal examination of children, would not work justly or advantageously. Irish children also coming direct from Ireland, where they had attended the National Schools, and the Scottish children coming from Scotland, probably, where they had attended the public schools, would have to go through their full number of attendances in English schools before they would be able to undergo any examination. He suggested that, as regarded half-timers, Boards of Guardians should have power to make bye-laws, without the intervention of the parishes.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON maintained that the tests which it was proposed that children should pass before going to labour were likely to work well. The Government were of opinion that it was advisable that the tests of knowledge and attendance should proceed *pari passû*. The standard would not be a very high one; but the Government must insist upon a certain number of attendances, because it would at least be a guarantee that the child had a certain amount of knowledge, and in the case of boys, who were naturally extremely dull, the Inspector would have a discretion to reduce the standard. The difficulty anticipated by the noble Marquess in respect to Scotch children was, he believed, already met by Clause 47 of the Bill; and as for Irish children, he would take their case into consideration. With regard to half-time in the agricultural districts, he did not think it would be safe to go to the length of giving the Guardians the power of passing compulsory bye-laws. To grant such a power would in fact be to turn the Unions into so many school boards, and that was what the Government had no desire to do. The best course appeared to him to be to allow every parish to fulfil the requirements of the Act in its own way.

The Marquess of RIPON said, that what he wished was that the noble Duke opposite the President of the Council would consider whether it was possible to separate the compulsory bye-laws from the half-time bye-laws.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 6, 7, and 8, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Exception to prohibition of employment of children).

Lord HENNIKER suggested the amendment of the clause with a view to put some check upon the action of Committees of Boards of Guardians in suspending the Bill during the time allowed in the clause. He should like to say a few words on this clause, as he had had charge of the Agricultural Children Act in its passage through their Lordships' House. He had not a word to say against its repeal, although it had cost him no little trouble; and whatever his opinion might be as to that Act, although not perfect, going far enough for the time, he was glad the Government had gone further now. However, the Act was shown to be of some use as a tentative measure, and it was more that than anything else, from the fact that this clause and other provisions of the Bill were taken from it. The fact was that, in several cases, the Act had been defeated more or less by granting the full time allowed for suspending it. In making the application some of the applicants had acknowledged their object was to make the Act as inoperative as possible. The clause was intended to give a power of suspension in cases of emergency, when the weather was unsettled, or there was a want of labour, and not to give it as a matter of course. He thought the working of the Act might be taken as a fair instance of how the clause might act. The age of 8 as against 10 for attendance at school had been tried. He thought 14 too high to begin with, and he should have preferred to see the age made 13, and no provision made such as the clause contained. In any case, he hoped Her Majesty's Government would consider the matter—whether it would not be wise to put some check on the action of Boards of Guardians—either by allowing them to suspend the operation of the Bill, with the leave of the Education Department, or in some other way.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON thought this was unnecessary, as it was only for the necessary operations of husbandry and the in-gathering of the crops that the Act could be relaxed for a period not exceeding six weeks in the year, upon due notice to the Education Department; while, moreover, in many parts of the country the school holidays were usually given at harvest time, and the children then assisted at the in-gathering of the crops. He did not think it likely that Boards of Guardians would be inclined to do anything that would be likely to impede harvesting operations.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Payment of school fees for poor parents).

Earl FORTESCUE objected to the provision that a parent, by reason of any such payment, should not be held to be a pauper. Both Houses had just agreed to a clause stating it to be the duty of every parent to provide education for his children up to a certain age, just as he was before legally bound to provide them with lodging, food, and clothing. The law could take no cognizance of the reason of a man's inability to provide for himself and his family. He might have permanently disabled himself by doing some most meritorious and even heroic act. He equally became legally a pauper by receiving relief out of the rates. In this Bill they were entering on a course of what he must call gushing legislation.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON thought that an agricultural labourer with five or six children might be unable to pay for the education of the whole of his family and yet might not be a pauper.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 11 *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Proceedings on disobedience to order of court for attendance at school.)

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said, he had considerable doubts as to the wisdom of this provision. The Industrial Schools Acts laid down a category of children who might be sent to industrial schools; that category was very wide, but the proposal in the Bill would make it still wider. He thought the clause objectionable on two grounds—first, because it gave an advantage to improvident parents; and, secondly, because it might interfere with the efficient working of those industrial schools. He would like to know from his noble Friend opposite the President of the Council what class of children it was intended should be sent to those schools?

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he thought the clause applied to the class of children whom his noble Friend the Vice President of the Council had called "wastrel," children who did not attend school, and could not, unless the school fees were paid for them.

Clause verbally *amended,* and *agreed to.*

Clause 13 *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Licence to child sent to industrial school to live out while attending school).

EARL FORTESCUE, who moved the omission of the clause, said he objected strongly to throwing on the ratepayers the expenses of industrial schools. Such a course would discourage voluntary aid. He contended that this and the following three or four clauses were objectionable, as they tended to break down the principles on which all the legislation dealing with pauperism for half a century had been founded. The children of labourers, though not paupers, would be educated at the expense of the ratepayers. That was most undesirable in itself, and full of danger as a precedent.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that schools founded on the same principle were found to work well in Scotland, and would form the means of inculcating useful habits among the children. For these reasons he was unable to assent to the Motion of the noble Lord.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 15 (Amendment as to provision of industrial school by school board).

EARL FORTESCUE objected to the proposal to give meals to children in day industrial schools at the expense of the ratepayers, because it was still more undesirable in itself and dangerous as a precedent.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, there was a certain class of children who could not be got to school by any other means except industrial schools, and who, if they were not educated, would at a later period of life fill our gaols. The clause involved no new precedent. The system was not only strongly recommended by the Rev. Sydney Turner, but was working with remarkable success in Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Bristol. It was an experiment, and, if it failed, the Secretary of State would withhold his certificate. But it would be unwise on the part of the Legislature not to try this experiment, because these day industrial schools, which were much cheaper than the industrial boarding schools, reached children who could not otherwise be got at, and because it was hoped that that these schools would not only benefit the children, but, by implanting among them habits of order, cleanliness, and discipline, would have a civilizing influence in the homes of the parents.

EARL FORTESCUE did not undervalue the influence of these institutions, but there was a wide difference between such as were supported by private individuals and such as were maintained out of the rates. The Rev. Sydney Turner's authority on such a question was deservedly high; but at a conference of members of Boards of Guardians, and of the Charity Organization Society, and other benevolent persons eminently qualified to discuss this subject, Mr. Turner was almost alone in maintaining the expediency of the course adopted by the Government. Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. John Macgregor were also opposed to this proposal, and against such an array of testimony he could not accept Mr. Sydney Turner's authority as conclusive. He, unlike some political economists, approved of industrial day schools supported by private benevolence. But perhaps their greatest value consisted in eliciting sentiments of gratitude in children accustomed to ill-usage and neglect, by making them feel the benefits and believe in the existence of evidently disinterested kindness and care. Education and food, provided out of rates and taxes, would be grudgingly given and thankfully received. Industrial day schools would lose the most valuable part of their moral influence under this Bill.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Establishment, &c., by day industrial schools).

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON objected to the sub-section which provided that the 2*s.* a-week, if recovered from the parent of the child, should be paid over to the local authority. The school might be mainly established by benevolent persons, yet the fees were to be paid over neither to the Treasury nor to the managers. It was quite right that the Treasury should pay the schooling for the child, and be then recouped for the advance; but he thought it very wrong that the managers should not get the surplus, if there were a surplus. The system adopted in the day industrial schools was a much better one.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, these children could only be sent to the industrial schools whose managers were willing to receive them, and thus the managers would be able to make what bargain they liked with the local authority. If they did receive a child, they could do so on what terms they pleased. It cost more to restrain at school a vicious child than a well-conducted one; but that was the nature of all control, and larger sums thus expended were a necessary expenditure that was not in any way in the nature of a premium.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON did not think there would be a power for the local authority to make a bargain with the conductors of industrial schools.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 17 *agreed to.*

Earl Fortescue

Clause 18 (Contribution for fees of children who obtain certificates).

EARL FORTESCUE expressed his apprehension that a too high standard of education would attract the lower classes of children to higher pursuits than those which they had hitherto mostly followed. The really pre-eminently able and energetic among the wage class had now in this country far greater facilities for self-culture, and raising themselves to wealth and distinction than they had ever had before. Such examples, however, must always be few and exceptional. But there was great danger just now of those engaged in what political economists called the work of verification becoming too numerous in proportion to those engaged in the work of distribution, and above all of production. The verificatory class consisting of lawyers' clerks, accountants, and such like, together with a large number of the distributing class, were engaged in writing, cyphering, or other kinds of the lightest manual labour; and there was now notoriously a severe competition among those who were hereditarily and naturally candidates for such employment. While of the producing class, upon the result of whose work both the other classes depended, the large majority were engaged in heavy bodily labour; and of these, as the great rise in wages latterly proved, the supply was now rather short. It was particularly unwise, therefore, just now by this clause to tempt some of the rather more intelligent boys all over the country to quit their natural sphere of labour, where they were wanted, and would help to elevate and enlighten their fellows, for the sake of pushing into the already overcrowded ranks of the verifiers and distributors. He must protest against such sentimental legislation contrary to sound principle and the requirements of the present time.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON replied that the object of the clause was to improve the education of the children by the offer of what corresponded with the small scholarships of the Universities for the higher classes.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 19 to 42, inclusive, *agreed to,* with Amendments.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY moved, in page 21, after Clause 42, to insert the following Clause:—

> "Nothing in Clause 14 of the Act of 1870 shall be construed as excluding the 'Ten Commandments,' the 'Lord's Prayer,' and the 'Apostles Creed,' from the teaching in schools provided by school boards,"

and pointed out that though Clause 14 was not intended to exclude the Ten Commandments and Lord's Prayer, yet it had been so interpreted in many cases. Only a few weeks ago a member of the London School Board handed in a protest against the Fourth Commandment having been asked for in an examination of boys for some prizes, and the Chairman had received the protest. A noble Lord had told him that a Government Inspector had upheld the view that Clause 14 prohibited the Ten Commandments and Lord's Prayer; another noble Lord had told him that this view was quite wrong, and that if any one applied to the Court of Chancery, it would upset it. How was a poor labourer to apply to the Court of Chancery—this was like the Judge who, on sentencing a labourer, told him he ought, instead of doing as he had done, to have sued for damages, and then come to their Lordships' House for a divorce. Under the late Government the vicar of Macclesfield had been told by the Education Office that it was illegal to have the Ten Commandments suspended in a building temporarily used for board-school purposes. This was to put a sort of slur on the Ten Commandments, and he would ask with what face could any justice of the peace sentence a boy for theft who had been brought up in a board school where the Ten Commandments were never taught?

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON said, he could not accept the Amendment. In the great bulk of board schools throughout the country the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer were already taught; and it was not because one of the members of the London School Board protested against the teaching of the Fourth Commandment that such an Amendment as this should be passed, and to pass it would not advance religious teaching at all, which the Government was quite as desirous to advance as the noble Lord could be. Those who did not desire religious teaching would remain as they were now and would not give religious teaching, while those who gave religious education now would not be benefited by the clause.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY thought the noble Lord would act wisely in withdrawing the clause, because it might throw doubt on that on which he hoped there was no doubt whatever—namely, that it was competent to any school board to teach the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Creed under the existing law. As a matter of fact they were now taught in board schools.

Lord HAMPTON, for the reason given by the most rev. Primate, also urged the noble Lord to withdraw the Amendment. If the parents would not permit their children to receive such instruction it was not the fault of the school boards.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said, that after the statement of the most rev. Primate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) which had been anticipated by the noble Duke (the Lord President of the Council), he should be happy to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the House, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Schedules *agreed to.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received *To-morrow;* and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 226.)

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL.

COMMONS AMENDMENTS.

Order of the Day for considering the Commons Amendments, read.

Lord DENMAN, in pursuance of a printed Notice as to Clause 5, objected to three Law Lords being necessary to form a quorum.

The LORD CHANCELLOR observed that the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord was not relevant to the Bill.

Lord DENMAN said, that as an Amendment had been made to the clause in another place, he had a right to move an Amendment. He accordingly moved that the clause be not agreed to. By this clause not only Lord Kingsdown, if he had still been a Member of their Lordships' House, would have been insufficient to make up a quorum of three, but also the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees (who had carried a Standing Order to the same effect) would have been considered insufficient, even if desired by both parties (in an Appeal) to be one of three. He read to their Lordships a letter from Lord Hatherley, in which his Lordship wrote that it would be "idle to call the new tribunal the House of Lords, though his Lordship hoped it might be made a very good Court." By the measure the character of their Lordships' House as an Appellate Tribunal was entirely changed, and he thought so important a matter should not be determined without the fullest consideration.

LORD REDESDALE said, he could not agree with the purport of the noble and learned Lord's (Lord Denman's) Amendment. The noble and learned Lord was wholly mistaken in thinking that the character of the House as an Appellate Tribunal would be altered. The Appellate Jurisdiction of the House would remain what it was, and all that the Bill would do was to secure the necessary attendance of Peers, who would be qualified by their legal attainments to advise the House on difficult legal questions. In 1873 the Leaders of both Parties agreed to recommend the taking away of that Jurisdiction from their Lordships; and that course was approved of in 1874 and 1875. Then a change came over the mind of the House, and public opinion was strongly expressed in a variety of ways against the removal of the Appellate Jurisdiction from the House. It was very remarkable that the change in public opinion was spontaneous, and uninfluenced by the leading Parties on either side. Ultimately, it was resolved that the Jurisdiction of that House should be retained, the consideration of the manner in which that should be done being deferred to the present Session. The Bill did not take away the privilege of any noble Lord to attend the hearing of appeals, and under it the Appellate Court would be as much the House of Lords as it ever was. He believed the country was satisfied with the tribunal of the House of Lords, and he hoped that the Bill would become part of the law of the land this Session, for there was a prestige attaching to that House as a tribunal which could not be acquired for generations by any other Court of Appeal which might be substituted for it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the Question before the House was simply the consideration of the Amendments which the Commons had made in that Bill, and he therefore could not enter upon a discussion of its principle. The great subject of that Bill sent down to the other House was the question of this House as the Tribunal of Ultimate Appeal of the country; and he thought he was correct in saying that on that subject the House of Commons had made absolutely no alteration in the measure, but had only supplemented it by those financial provisions which could only spring from the other House, and could not be introduced in this House. He could not refrain from expressing his feelings of gratitude at the course taken by the other House in the matter. The provisions of the Bill on that subject were matters on which different opinions might well be entertained, and actually were entertained by various persons in the House of Commons. Those opinions were placed in abeyance, and that Bill now came back to their Lordships in that respect exactly as it had been sent down to the other House. Though there were several Amendments made in the Bill there were only two of importance. One, to which he thought no objection could reasonably be offered, related to the Intermediate Court of Appeal, and the position of things with respect to that Court was this—Under the Act of last year the Lord Chancellor had power to take from each of the three Divisions of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer one Judge to assist in the work of the Intermediate Court of Appeal. When this Bill went to the other House considerable objection was taken to that provision. It was said that its working would be uncertain and unsatisfactory, that there would be a change in the Judges, and that the object should be to obtain Judges who would be permanent. The first important Amendment was to meet that defect. A provision was introduced for the actual transfer of three primary Judges to the Intermediate Court of Appeal, but these Judges might be required to go on Circuit. The second important Amendment provided that rules might be made to insure to a much greater degree than at present the hearing by a single Judge of cases in the Divisions of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, so as to produce to a greater extent than could now be done the same results as were obtained in the Chancery Division, whereby points of law were decided at the hearing of cases, and it was rendered unnecessary to refer those points to the Court *in Banco.* Those were the only Amendments of any substance which had now to be considered. He hoped the results of the attention which had been bestowed upon this Bill would be to materially improve our system of Judicature.

LORD COLERIDGE said, he thought the compromise that had been effected was a reasonable one, and one which he thought would work well in practice. He had laid on the Table a Notice that he would call the attention of the House to the working of the Judicature Act, and move for a Return to supplement one which had been previously obtained; but, perhaps, it would be more convenient and save time if he said what he had got to say on the consideration of these Amendments. Unfortunately, the controversy, if controversy it ought to be called which dealt with matters of fact, was conducted on certain inconvenient conditions, because those who really knew about the working of the Act up to this time were not, with the single exception of the person now addressing their Lordships, able to speak in that or the other House of Parliament, and of course they could not enter on a controversy in the newspapers, and those who, he was quite satisfied unintentionally, had misrepresented the facts of the case had not that definite information which was essential for dealing with this very important question. He was, therefore, sorry to find from the statements that had appeared in the newspapers and which had been made "elsewhere" that there had been very gross exaggerations as regarded the present arrears. The Act divided the Courts of Justice into the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal. He would take first, the working of the High Court of Justice, which, as their Lordships would remember, was divided into five Divisions, but for all ordinary purposes into three—namely, the Divisions represented by the Vice Chancellors, by the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, and by the Probate and Admiralty Courts. The working of the Chancery Division had been somewhat slow, because the most salutary practice of *vivâ voce* examination had been introduced. Anyone who knew anything about the matter would see that if we tried cases by *vivâ voce* examination, they would take up a longer time, ; but, for all that, there was no comparison between that system and the system of affidavits for eliciting the truth. Every one knew perfectly well that the result of affidavits drawn by the score, settled by the counsel, and sworn to, perhaps, without much examination, could not for a moment be compared with the result attained by examination and cross-examination *vivâ voce.* In the Probate and Admiralty Courts there was very little difference, except that as the Judge of the Probate Court could call in the Judge of the Admiralty, he believed, on the whole, more important work had been got out of that Division. He now came to what he understood better—namely, the working of the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Division. And, first, with regard to sittings *in Banco*, he had to say that there were, practically speaking, no arrears. He did not mean that there might not be some few cases standing over, but practically there were no arrears at all. Therefore as far as regarded two very important portions of the High Court of Justice, the work had been done to a greater extent than he believed had ever been done before. He quite admitted that in trial by jury cases there were very considerable arrears. He had to say, however, that as to this matter there had been gross exaggeration. The fact of the exaggeration was unquestionable. There was no kind of use in disputing about the facts. He did not invent these statements; but he desired their Lordships to know the facts, in order that they might see how far the Amendments made in the Bill were really well founded. The question was how many cases were standing for trial, and it was a question of figures and nothing else, and his authorities for the figures he had given on a previous occasion, and was about to give, were of the best kind—namely, the Associates of the Courts—Mr. Campbell, Mr. Erle, and Mr. Pollock. He said then, and now repeated a statement which he saw was questioned "elsewhere"—that, whereas between November, 1874, and November, 1875, the Judges sat 540 days in London and Middlesex to try cases, they sat for 676 days from November, 1875, up to the close of the sittings in 1876. Some doubt had been cast upon his meaning in the use of the expression "judicial days." What he meant was, of course, that if two Judges each sat for 30 days the result was 60 judicial days; and he repeated that there had been 150 or thereabouts more days spent by the same number of Judges in the same time since the passing of the Judicature Act compared with the number of days' sittings by the same Judges in the same time and upon the same work before the passing of the Act. Further, he stated, and now repeated, that in the words of the Return furnished to him—

> "Every action which has been entered for trial since the Judicature Act came into operation has been tried within three months of its entry, and every action now left untried since the beginning of the Long Vacation will have been standing for trial less than three months."

In his statement he made no distinction between common jury and special jury cases; it applied unreservedly to both classes. He did not mean to say that three months was no time to wait or that the arrear was not a large arrear; but he did say that to talk of the Act having broken down, of the state of things being unprecedented, was to indulge in extravagant language and to go altogether beyond what the facts of the case, as he believed them to be, warranted. Nobody could foretell what would happen hereafter, but as they began last year with 549 cases, and as they would begin the next year with 600 or 700, it was not unlikely that by the end of the year the arrear would be got rid of. It was alleged, first, that the business was shown to be declining, and yet that more time was taken to try fewer cases, which was said to prove the bad working of the system; and, secondly, it was said that the sittings of the Judges had neither been so continuous nor so long as they ought to have been. Now, it was almost a universal rule that as you amended procedure and made it more reasonable and expeditious, you diminished the quantity, but increased the quality of the business that was left. It was wholly fallacious to go back a good many years and say there were then more writs issued, and a larger number of cases tried. That was true, but those were days when a larger number of cases were undefended, when a number of small technical questions arose for decision, and when the parties, by interlocutories and discoveries, did not know each other's hands as they did now. A larger number of such cases might be tried in the same period; they did not occupy the same amount of judicial time. But now almost every case coming before the Judge and jury was a substantial case. By proceedings in Chambers and otherwise the chaff was winnowed away, the case on both sides was ascertained and understood, and when the parties came into Court it was upon a substantial issue. Under one of the most useful provisions of the Judicature Act it was ordered that a defendant should swear to his defence; he could no longer keep the plaintiff at arm's length, but was put to his oath. Then, again, he understood that a large portion of business which, before the Judicature Act, would come into Court, was now disposed of in Chambers, and did not figure in the returns of cases. But it was business done all the same, and in any fair and candid comparison of systems it must be taken into account as business now done in one way, while before the Judicature Act it was disposed of in another way. He ventured to say, therefore, that the amount of litigious business before the Judges was not, substantially at all events, smaller at the present moment than in previous years. The Judges, he thought, had good ground to complain of observations made upon them elsewhere, as though they had not been loyal to the spirit of the Act, and, instead of doing their best to carry it into effect, had been obstructive and prevented the proper working of the Act. He was certain that this sort of attack upon the Judges would receive no countenance from his noble and learned Friend opposite (the Lord Chancellor) who had said no more than was just—though it was generously and kindly said—in moving the second reading of this Bill—namely, that the Judges, so far from obstructing the operation of the Act, had accepted it loyally and with ardour and energy. A more unfair and unfounded accusation than to say that they had in any way obstructed the fair working of the Act was never made by any man in any place, however considerable the man and however high the place. It was absolutely unfounded. In January and February so much had the work diminished that a Judge might occasionally not have been sitting. But speaking for himself and all the Judges he knew, and excepting the short statutory vacations, there had been no Judge who had not in some place or in some Court been sitting day by day from November 2, 1875, up to the present time. A good deal had been said about Circuits, and he wished to state that it was perfectly indifferent to the Judges whether they sat in London or the country; they did not care where the work was. He said that so far as he knew a full amount of work had been required from the Judges. It must be remembered that the presence throughout the country of the Judges on Circuit had an importance of its own which ought not to be measured, and which could not be fairly measured, by the particular number of hours consumed by the Judges. Indirect, yet most valuable, results were produced by the presence of the Judges in various parts of England. He altogether denied that the mode of criticism which had been applied to those learned persons was a fair, or a generous, or a right mode of criticism at all. When he saw it stated that the Judges ought to work in shifts, that they only considered their own convenience, and that they did not think of the public whom they ought to serve, he maintained that that was not seemly language, but language which the facts of the case did not in any degree or in any manner justify. So far as his own Court was concerned, he maintained that the working of the High Court had, upon the whole, been successful. He did not say he should not have preferred to state that there were no arrears in the *Nisi Prius* Court, but he did assert that if what he had stated to their Lordships was anything like the truth, the exaggerated statements on the subject must be attributable in a great degree to the circumstance that sufficient attention had not been paid to the figures and facts before those statements were made. We were hardly yet in a position to judge what the normal working of the High Court would be. It seemed to him to be as unreasonable to legislate on the existing state of things as it would have been to come to Parliament in January and to say—"Abolish three Judges because there is not sufficient work for them." With reference to the Amendments in the Bill they revolutionized the system of Common Law procedure, and he considered that it was inconvenient and unfortunate that a change of this great importance should have been introduced into this House on the 10th of August in a Bill which had been much altered in the House of Commons since it left their Lordships some time ago. As the Bill went from the House their Lordships fully concurred with it, but it was now sent back in an entirely different form from that in which it left. Was it unreasonable to effect a change of that very considerable importance without any consultation, or the possibility of consultation, with those who had to administer the law? A very large majority of those persons were opposed to the change, and he ventured to think there was no real reason for its being effected at all. It was said to be made with the universal assent of the Profession, but he emphatically denied that the assent of the Profession had been even asked for anything like this change. He entertained great respect for those barristers who happened to be Members of the House of Commons, but he denied that they generally represented the feeling of the Profession on the subject, and he should require a much stronger *consensus* of opinion for the absolute destruction of the old system of Common Law, under which there was a trial of disputed facts before a jury and an adjudication on disputed points of law by a Court *in Banco*. He would now read some extracts from a letter addressed to him by his excellent Colleague Mr. Justice Brett—

> "First, it is alteration in a panic of legislation hardly yet dry. This block of causes at *Nisi Prius* in London and Middlesex is probably only temporary. Secondly, the proposed plan ignores entirely the essential difference between the causes tried before juries and those tried before Vice Chancellors. The causes in the Common Law Divisions are those which arise in the ever-varying transactions of every-day life. There is not a month, or even a week, in which some new combination does not arise in business, and therefore some totally new application of law does not arise. It seems never to be understood by those who are not conversant with the administration of law by Judge and jury that the trial before the jury is to ascertain what are the facts of that new combination, and that the law must be applied after the facts are ascertained. Let any one look into

> the Reports, and he will see how incessantly new business, which is, in other words, a new point of law, arises. It is practically impossible, from want of time and books, that each new point should be determined at the *Nisi Prius* trial, as Mr. Gregory's Amendment, for instance, supposes it could be. If the point were then to be determined, either *Nisi Prius* trials must be postponed for months or the number of Judges and Courts must be increased by 60. And if each new point were reserved for the determination of the same Judge sitting in London or for another single Judge sitting alone, it is practically impossible to suppose that the number of appeals would not be increased ten or twenty-fold. Suppose an opinion expressed by Baron Bramwell or Mr. Justice Blackburn, let us say, at the trial referred to any Judge you may think wholly inferior or whom the public may think wholly inferior, and his judgment is different from the opinion; or even if the single judgment be that of the most trusted of the Judges. The assumption is that the point or application is new. Now, is it possible to suppose that it will be acquiesced in? I will give two or three instances which are recent—the crossed cheques, the negotiability of foreign bonds or coupons, the questions now raised as to disclosures or concealments in a prospectus, customs of the Stock Exchange, &c. The truth is that the proposal would make the Court of Appeal the only Court *in Banco*, and so the House of Lords the first instead of the second Court of Appeal. It is only, in fact, upon the question of a suggested misdirection that the Courts *in Banco* are a Court of Appeal. As to points reserved or special cases or other motions, they are a Court of First Instance upon questions of law. It may be that a single Judge should more often sit to hear points of practice; but that requires no legislation. Thirdly, if the Judges are to determine each of them singly these questions of law which so constantly arise, all idea of authority, which has hitherto been the backbone of the consistency of the law, must cease. Surely it cannot be supposed that the decision of a single Judge is to be cited as a binding authority to another single Judge. Such things as reported cases, which are now more useful even to prevent litigation than to guide it, must cease. No lawyer will be able to advise his client that the point has been decided by a binding authority; at all events, not till the Court of Appeal has decided; and so, again, that appeals must multiply. Fourthly, how is the work to be distributed? Three Judges in the Court of Appeal—are these to be three sitting singly, as it were, *in Banco?* If so, are there to be six at *Nisi Prius* and one at Chambers? That gives 13. Are five to be idle? Or are there to be more than three Courts *in Banco* or more than six at *Nisi Prius?* If yes, where are the Courts and the Bar? Fifth, what is to become of the peculiar business—the Revenue cases in the Exchequer, the magisterial and other cases in the Queen's Bench, the election cases (Parliamentary and Municipal) in the Common Pleas? Sixth, is not the veiled idea the idea of doing away with trial by jury? Seventh, I should say that at present nine-tenths of the daily Common Law disputes—*i.e.*, cases—stop at the Court *in Banco*, whereas under the proposed system those nine-tenths would almost all go to the Court of Appeal. For these reasons I have no doubt as to the extreme danger and ruin of a scheme which seems to me to be utterly thoughtless."

It was further said that the spectacle was often seen of three Judges hearing cases which men of ordinary intellect might dispose of in a few minutes. Now, he did not aspire to the intellect of his learned Friend who made those observations; but when he spoke of three Judges frequently sitting to decide points which a clerk in a counting-house might dispose of, he could only say that was a state of things which had not come under his own observation. For his own part, he found the strain upon his mind, though, perhaps, not so long, greater since he had the honour of a seat on the Bench than when he practised as a barrister, and his learned Friend in making the comments to which he referred laboured, he could not help thinking, under an entire misapprehension. Under all the circumstances of the case, he might add, he saw no necessity whatever for altering the present system. All that was required to be done was to give the Judges power in the less important cases. At all events, nothing like the alteration proposed in the Amendments before the House was, he believed, at all necessary or would be found in practice to be at all useful. He came, in the next place, to the working of the Court of Appeal, which was, in his opinion, a question somewhat different from the working of the High Court. His noble and learned Friend on the Woolsack had been so kind as to furnish him with a Return as to the working of the Court of Appeal in regard to appeals from the different Divisions of the High Court, and he found that for a period of five years, commencing in 1871, the number of appeals from the Common Law Divisions was 245, whereas the number from the Vice Chancellors' Courts was 1,012. During portions of that time up to the passing of the Judicature Act there were, he admitted, many matters in which the decisions of the Courts of Common Law were final, and that many of the appeals from the Vice Chancellors' Courts were with reference to small matters, so that it was exceedingly difficult to say what deduction ought to be made in making the contrast upon those two grounds. Still there remained the fact of the three

Common Law Courts sitting *in Banco* for five years with only 245 appeals, while there were 1,012 during the same time from the Courts of the Vice Chancellors. His noble and learned Friend had also been good enough to furnish him with a Return with respect to the Court of Appeal for the present year, which included the appeals from the Chancery as well as from the Common Law Divisions. From that Return it appeared that the number of appeals from the Chancery Division was 200, from the Queen's Bench Division 36, from the Divisional Court of Appeal 3, from the Common Pleas 27, from the Exchequer 45, from the Probate and Divorce Division 18, or in all 129. So that there were 200 appeals from the Chancery Division as against 129 from all the other Divisions. Those were facts which did not at all tend to encourage, in his opinion, the idea that the business of the Courts would diminish under the change which was proposed. In conclusion, he thought no Act had worked more successfully than the present, or was more generally satisfactory to the Profession; and as to the Court of Appeal, no Court, he believed, ever started under fairer auspices. It was difficult to say why it was not now viewed by them with the same favour as in the first instance. That was, he believed, due to other and temporary causes rather than its constitution. There was the great difficulty of a Court with permanent Judges as distinguished from Judges sitting from time to time, and although a difference of opinion existed among the Judges upon the point, yet he was strongly of opinion that amid much that was evil in the old system of the Court of Exchequer, there was the good that it prevented all distinctions of rank as among the Judges. Although undoubtedly there were inconveniences and difficulties in the working of the old Court of Exchequer Chamber, he must say that he thought the judgments of that Court commanded the respect of the Profession, and were looked up to. He thought that the portion of the Commons Amendments which added three Judges to the permanent Court of Appeal was a mistake, and that it would be better that all the superior Judges should from time to time take their places in the Court of Appeal. It was not a matter of sentiment with him; he held his opinions because he really believed that for a considerable space of time the working of the Common Law Courts had been greatly for the benefit of the people of this country. He felt in a matter of this kind he was really in the hands of Her Majesty's Government, and he knew that in legal subjects Her Majesty's Government was his noble and learned Friend. He had submitted his views, and he left them with his noble and learned Friend on the Woolsack.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he would not enter upon a general discussion upon the subject under consideration, as he thought it would be better to reserve whatever observations he might have to make upon the Amendments until they were put in their turn, but there was one observation which his noble and learned Friend opposite (Lord Coleridge) had made unconnected with the Amendments to which he must respond at once. His noble and learned Friend had heard that the learned Judges had placed themselves in antagonism to the Judicature Act, and that in some way they were thwarting its operations. He had been reminded by his noble and learned Friend that he (the Lord Chancellor) had borne testimony to the learned Judges, and his noble and learned Friend asked him was he prepared to repeat it? He was prepared in the most unqualified way to repeat that testimony, and he took the opportunity of bearing witness to what he called before, and called now, not only the loyalty, but the generous and most efficient manner in which the learned Judges had combined to put into operation the very large changes inaugurated by the Judicature Act. He believed they had done that not merely in obedience to the law, which they would have obeyed; he could go farther than that—he could say from his personal knowledge that the majority of the members of the Judicial Bench were not only prepared to obey the law, but were of opinion that the changes made by the Judicature Act were most beneficial and desirable changes. The other day there was an occurrence which had been the subject of remark, and there was a difference of opinion as to whether a particular action should be tried at a particular place before a jury. He did not disguise that he had an opinion as to what the law in that particular case was, but he was not going to state now what that opinion was; but it was clear that this was a matter in which the Judges might differ in opinion as to what the law was. Whatever their opinion, they did not evince the slightest disposition on their part to fail to comply loyally and properly with the enactments of the Judicature Act. His noble and learned Friend referred to some criticisms made upon the arrangements for Circuit. He knew it was stated that a larger time was allotted for Circuits than was absolutely necessary. He knew the learned Judges were in a difficulty on this subject. Some persons thought the business would not be increased, others held a different opinion; but the learned Judges had no *data* by which they could tell how that might be. He must add one other observation, and that was to bear testimony to the way in which the learned Judges discharged their duties under great difficulties as to the accommodation in the places in which they discharged the *Nisi Prius* cases. He was sorry to say the accommodation was not sufficient. They were put into garrets and corners utterly unfit for them to sit in, and there they had to discharge labours under difficulties which other public servants would not submit to.

Lord DENMAN said, that as the 6th clause contained an Amendment in fixing the salary of the new Judges (which went out either with blanks or red letters), he was justified in moving an Amendment to it, he believed that two new Vice Chancellors, with power to sit as Judges of Chancery Appeal with the Lords Justices on the plan of the Exchequer Chamber, would be far more useful than the two Judges contemplated by the Bill, and hoped that retired Chancellors and Judges and those already Peers, whilst continuing to be Judges in England, Scotland, and Ireland, would not cease to give the weight of their authority and experience in cases when the House of Lords might be sitting on Appeals in vacation, or between a Dissolution and a New Parliament.

Commons Amendments *considered.*

Commons Amendments up to Clause 12 *agreed to.*

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he had now to ask their Lordships to agree to the two Amendments which had been commented on by his noble and learned Friend opposite (Lord Coleridge). As regarded the first, which dealt with the Intermediate Court, with the exception of what had been said by his noble and learned Friend, whatever differences of opinion might have presented themselves to the minds of the learned Judges of the Supreme Court on the subject, he was happy to say he had received no unfavourable representations from them concerning it. The necessity for it was obvious, and his noble and learned Friend had himself admitted that the Court did not come up to his expectations. There was an Intermediate Court of Appeal, to which only three regular Judges were attached. For assistance they had to depend on the casual attendance of other Judges who might be able to spare some time from the business of their own Courts. There was another Amendment that that Intermediate Court of Appeal should sit in two divisions. Now, how was it possible for two divisions of that Court to sit in proper strength with only three regular Judges to transact the business? Of course, an addition to the number of Judges was required. Well, last year he proposed that, except at Circuit time, three of the primary Judges should be required to attend in the Intermediate Court of Appeal. That arrangement had not been found so satisfactory in practice as might have been expected, and the House of Commons therefore said that three of the primary Judges should be altogether transferred to the Court of Appeal, except during times of Circuit as before—in other words, that, except with the obligation of going Circuit, three primary Judges should be made regular members of the Court of Appeal. That was the Amendment he had now to propose. It was, it seemed to him, one more of form than of substance, and he apprehended that there would be no objection to it.

Amendment *agreed to.*

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he now came to the second Amendment which related to the procedure in the primary Courts. His noble and learned Friend opposite (Lord Coleridge) had remarked that it was a very large and serious change to propose at so late a period of the Session. For his own part, he must say that the change proposed was certainly not a novelty, inasmuch as it had been discussed over and over again both in and out of their Lordships' House, and it was difficult to imagine the procedure of the Courts being upon a proper footing so long as there were three Divisions of the High Court in which the procedure was entirely different from what it was in another Division. It was impossible to justify having in one Division only one Judge to dispose of precisely the same kind of business as in the other Divisions was disposed of before three Judges. He was glad that public opinion had ripened so rapidly as it had done upon this question, as was shown by the fact that in the House of Commons the Amendment was agreed to almost unanimously, and there was no division upon it. His noble and learned Friend had spoken of the violence of the change, but what had been done with regard to the different Divisions of the High Court of Justice? All the Divisions were now branches of one Court, and although certain distinctive names had been kept up, a person might commence a case in any one of the different Divisions he liked. Could his noble and learned Friend give any possible reason why a case presented for trial in the Exchequer Division of the High Court and disposed of by one Judge should, if brought on in the Court of Common Pleas, require three Judges? The Chancery arrangement might be wrong; if so, let it be altered. But there could not be for one Court a rule which would not apply to another. With regard to juries, no difficulty could arise; there might be a jury in the Court of Chancery as much as in the Court of Queen's Bench. As a consequence of the new system of Judicature, the Court of Chancery was absorbing Common Law cases. The Court of Chancery, indeed, was actually becoming blocked from the number of Common Law cases which came before it, suitors being attracted to it by the greater convenience it presented. Taking the suits commenced in town during the first year of the Judicature Act, and comparing them with the Returns for the year previous, he found that the increase in the Chancery Division was no less than 33 per cent—a fact which could not be accounted for except in the way he had said. There had been a great deal of discussion about appeals. It might now be taken as settled that there should be two appeals—intermediate and final—but if his noble and learned Friend's view were carried out there would be three appeals. There would be first the decision at *Nisi Prius*, then an appeal to the Court *in Banco*, next an appeal to the Intermediate Court, and lastly an appeal to the Final Court. Now, did his noble and learned Friend really mean to say that that was his view of a perfect system? He very much doubted whether there would be a great multiplication of appeals, and was disposed to think that when a single Judge disposed of the law of the case, he was almost as likely to be right as where there were more Judges, at least for primary jurisdiction. But even supposing there were more appeals, the Intermediate Court would have to decide more, which would be a much better thing than having three Courts of co-ordinate authority, and would, he thought, have a much more steady effect on the law. It was not meant that where facts had to be decided they were to be decided by the Judge, but by the jury, as heretofore; and the law would be applied by the Judge who had heard those facts. Had the Court *in Banco* been such a sacred institution, and had it had such a great effect in settling the law? The Court *in Banco* had sat four in number; but it might now be constituted by two Judges, and even by one. So that great *palladium* of justice had dwindled down very much, as it might be composed of two Judges, and sometimes only of one. It would be etter to get rid of that which was little more than a phantom, and have a single Judge to apply the law to the facts which had been tried by a jury. All that the Amendment, therefore, did, was to say that as a general rule so far as convenient and practicable the one Judge who began the case should hear it to the end and apply the law to the facts when they had been ascertained by the jury. The clause was, however, very elastic, and would enable the Judges to make rules which would leave very important matters to be decided by the Courts *in Banco*. He did not think that the Amendment would interfere with the practice of the Courts. In his opinion it was a most valuable one—what he had said was the substance of the whole of it, and he was surprised that his noble and learned Friend thought it so serious a departure from present practice.

Amendment *agreed to.*

FORFEITURE RELIEF BILL.—(No. 210.)

(*The Earl of Limerick.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE EARL OF LIMERICK, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, briefly explained its object, which was to remedy the severe hardship caused to tenants in certain cases through forfeitures arising under breaches of covenant, however trivial might be their character. The measure left it entirely to the Court to say whether or not in its discretion the relief should be granted in any particular case. It had the sanction of some eminent Judges, and he believed that if sanctioned it would confer a great benefit on tenants without doing injury or wrong to their landlords. Beyond that there was a large *consensus* of opinion in favour of the principle of the Bill, which would effect an important improvement in the law; it had received the unanimous approval of the other House, and he hoped their Lordships would agree to the second reading, which he now moved.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Limerick.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he had examined the Bill as carefully as he could during the short time it had been before the House, and if he had to answer the question as to what he thought of it now, he should certainly say he thought it was a good Bill, and that it would not be productive of any injury to lessors in the cases to which it referred. He believed it had, as the noble Lord the Mover of the second reading had said, met with the approval of a great many eminent Judges, and it also seemed to have been drawn with care and with considerable professional skill. But he could not disguise from himself that it was a Bill which affected in a way that was very important a great mass of private property—in fact, hundreds of thousands of leases which might be most valuable. It might affect them without doing any injury to the lessor, but that was a matter on which the lessor ought to have an opportunity of judging for himself. He did not think at the end of the Session it would be right to pass a measure which affected private property so largely, and therefore the noble Lord would exercise a wise discretion if he would postpone asking for a decision on this question until next Session.

Motion, by leave of the House, *withdrawn*, and Order for 2ª *discharged.*

EGYPT—THE KHEDIVE AND THE NEW LEGAL TRIBUNALS.—QUESTION.

LORD EMLY said, their Lordships were aware that the ancient Consular Courts established by Treaty between the Porte and various Christian Powers had been abolished last year; that new Courts had been substituted by agreement between the Khedive and the Christian Powers, and that the jurisdiction of these new Courts had been settled by formal arrangement. The point to which he wished to invite attention was the jurisdiction conceded by the Khedive in the case of claims of foreigners against His Highness's private estate. No mode of attaching the Khedive's private estate existed before; but by the agreement which had been made, the Khedive conceded that his private estate should be subject to the jurisdiction of these Courts. Lately, however, an action was brought by a foreigner on account of a debt for which the private estate of the Khedive was liable, and a decision was given against His Highness; but he refused to allow its execution. The grounds of that refusal were, that in the month of May, after the Courts had been established, he issued a decree by which all liabilities of the nature of the plaintiff's claim were decreed to form a portion of the Public Debt of Egypt. But His Highness stated at the time he refused to allow the execution of the decree of the Court, that he had referred his decision in the matter to the Government of this country and to the other foreign Powers with whose consent the new Courts had been formed. He now wished to ask the Secretary of State for

Foreign Affairs, Whether any communication from His Highness the Khedive of Egypt, inviting an expression of opinion as to his right to refuse to permit certain judgments of the new Tribunals established in Egypt has been received by Her Majesty's Government, and, if so, whether he has any objection to state what reply he had given to such communication? If the noble Earl was not at present prepared to answer the Question, perhaps, as the matter was of considerable interest, he would be good enough to lay the Papers on the Table and make known the decision of Her Majesty's Government at the earliest opportunity.

The Earl of DERBY: My Lords, there is no doubt of the importance to many persons, and of the importance upon general grounds, of the question to which the noble Lord has referred, and in answer I have to say I did receive a communication from the Khedive inviting an expression of opinion, and that request for an opinion is now under the consideration of the Government. The fact is that, although the question involved is not exclusively a legal one, still it turns to a considerable extent upon the construction to be placed on certain documents which have much of a legal character about them, and I was unwilling to decide without first obtaining the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown. At this time of the year, as the noble Lord well knows, the Law Officers have a great deal of business on their hands and some unavoidable delay has arisen. I am not therefore prepared to state what reply I have given to the communication, because I have given none, and until I am advised as to the legal points involved I shall not be prepared to give one. But, undoubtedly, it is desirable that this question should be disposed of without unnecessary delay, and I hope that my answer will not be long in coming. As I am not able to answer the Question now, I think it would be proper to adopt the alternative suggested by the noble Lord and lay the Papers on the Table.

House adjourned at half past Ten o'clock, till To-morrow, Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 10*th August*, 1876.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Committee*—Cruelty to Animals* [250]—R.P.

Committee—*Report*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Norwich and Boston (Corrupt Voters) [244]; Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland)* [286]; Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Boroughs) (*re-comm.*)* [229-294].

Considered as amended—*Third Reading*—Expiring Laws Continuance* [281], and *passed.*

Third Reading—Bow Street Police Court (Site)* [257]; Sheriff Courts (Scotland)* [289]; Agricultural Holdings (England) Act (1875) Amendment (*changed from* "Queen Anne's Bounty")* [278], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Local Loans (Ireland)* [231]; Public Record Office* [262]; Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices* [291]; Clean Rivers* [279].

TURKEY—LOANS OF 1854 AND 1871.

QUESTION.

Mr. ERRINGTON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, What amount has been remitted from Egypt to the Bank of England since the first of October last, for the service of the Ottoman Loans of 1854 and 1871; and, what amount now remains in the Bank of such remittances?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he had received the following from the Bank of England:—

"Statement of amount remitted from Egypt to the Bank of England for the service of the Imperial Ottoman Loans of 1854 and 1871, since the 1st October, 1875, and of the balances at present in hand.

"Imperial Ottoman Loan of 1854.			
"Amount received since 1st October, 1875	£130,536	2	3
"Balance in hand at this date.	61,150	4	10
"Imperial Ottoman Loan of 1871.			
"Amount received since 1st October, 1875.	£199,500	0	0
"Balance in hand at this date	116,922	10	0

"(Signed) F. May,
"Chief Cashier.

"Bank of England, 10th August, 1876."

THE APPROPRIATION ACT.

QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he will move for the appointment of a Select Committee, immediately the

House re-assembles, to inquire into the various changes made during modern times in the Appropriation Acts; also into the Exchequer and Audit Act (29 and 30 Vic. c. 39); the nature and extent of the audit applied to—the income and charge of the Consolidated Fund, the Civil Service Voted Funds, and Naval and Military Receipts and Expenditure; also as to the rules, orders, and forces for the audit business made by the Comptroller and Auditor General; also into the orders and instructions issued by the Treasury, or of those that might or ought, but have not been issued; and, finally, as to the form in which the resolutions should be drawn up for the decision of Parliament regarding the surpluses, excesses, deficiences, and other details, not alone, as at present, for the Naval and Military expenditure, but of the whole expenditure of every kind?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that the various matters referred to in the Question of the hon. and gallant Gentleman appeared to be matters which would properly come under the cognizance of the Committee on Public Accounts. If the hon. and gallant Gentleman was dissatisfied with what was done in respect to any of these matters, and if he would formulate his charge next Session, so as to let the Government see precisely what were the points of which he found reason to complain, there would be every disposition to find the means of inquiring into any allegations which he might make.

NAVY—THE SUPERINTENDENTS OF HER MAJESTY'S DOCKYARDS.

QUESTION.

MR. E. J. REED asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If any official remonstrance has been sent to the superintendents of Her Majesty's Dockyards against the cutting of ventilating apertures in the watertight bulkheads of Her Majesty's ships; and, if so, whether he will lay the Correspondence on this subject between the Admiralty and the Dockyards upon the Table of the House?

MR. HUNT, in reply, said, that no remonstrance had been sent, because the communications passing between the Admiralty and the Dockyards did not take the shape of a remonstrance; but the Board of Admiralty had expressed very strong dissatisfaction at what had taken place, and if the hon. Member would move for the correspondence it would be laid on the Table.

NAVY—DETERIORATION OF BOILERS.

QUESTION.

MR. E. J. REED asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he will inform the House, by laying documents upon the Table or otherwise, what results, if any, have followed the appointment, in April 1874, of a Committee to consider the rapid deterioration of boilers in Her Majesty's ships?

MR. HUNT, in reply, said, that the Committee appointed to inquire into the causes of deterioration of boilers in Her Majesty's ships had already made two preliminary Reports to him; but he was hoping that they would, before long, make a final Report. They were waiting the results of some experiments which they had directed to be made in connection with the subject into which they were inquiring.

CHANNEL ISLANDS—ROYAL COURT OF JERSEY.—QUESTION.

MR. LOCKE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is not contrary to constitutional usage for Orders in Council and Acts of Parliament, which are sent to the Royal Court of Jersey for registration, to be referred to the State Assembly for discussion; whether the States of Jersey, at their sitting on Friday 20th July last, decided not to register the Order in Council respecting the ecclesiastical district at Gouray, and also refused to register the Acts of Parliament which have been transmitted; and, whether, in the event of such refusal, Her Majesty's Government will send a peremptory order for registration?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, it was not contrary to Constitutional usage for Orders in Council and Acts of Parliament which were sent to the Royal Court of Jersey for registration to be referred to the States Assembly for discussion. It was obviously a proper course when the Court was of opinion that such registration would prove prejudicial or the Island was not specially included in an Order or Act of Parliament, and in any case of refusal Her Majesty's Government would await the receipt of any representation the Assembly might wish to make. No such representation had been received respecting the ecclesiastical district at Gouray.

AFRICA—THE GOLD COAST—CASE OF MESSRS. SWANZY.—QUESTION.

Mr. Alderman W. M'ARTHUR asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table, Copy of the Correspondence with the Dutch Government relative to the plunder and destruction of Messrs. F. and A. Swanzy's property at Dix Cove, on the Gold Coast, in the year 1869?

Mr. BOURKE: The claim of Messrs. Swanzy on account of destruction of their property on the Gold Coast was repeatedly brought before the Dutch Government. There was a conflict of evidence as to the facts, and the Dutch, relying on the reports of their own officials as contradicting the statement of Messrs. Swanzy's witnesses, refused to entertain their claim. There is not the slightest probability of their altering their decision. It would not be advisable to incur the expense of printing the Correspondence, which is very voluminous, extending over four years. Its publication would lead to no result.

PRICE OF GAS.—QUESTION.

Mr. Alderman W. M'ARTHUR asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether, in the event of any scheme being submitted to the Board of Trade for the amalgamation of the South Metropolitan Gaslight and Coke Company with any other Gas Company, the Board of Trade will make provision in such scheme that the maximum and standard price of *3s. 6d.*, limited by the Acts relating to the South Metropolitan Gaslight and Coke Company for gas supplied within the district of that Company, shall continue to be the standard price for gas within that district?

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY: Until such a scheme as is supposed is submitted I am unable to say beforehand what provision it would be necessary to insert in it before the Board of Trade could recommend it for confirmation by Order in Council.

ARMY—MILITIA SURGEONS.
QUESTION.

Captain NOLAN asked the Secretary of State for War, If the new Warrant relating to Militia Surgeons will not in some cases reduce the net income of these officers by over £100 a-year; and, whether, in such cases, he will allow existing Surgeons to retain their present appointments with the allowances which were in force when they accepted these appointments; or, failing this, will he grant them an adequate compensation?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, that the income of Militia medical officers derived from Army Votes depended upon so many considerations that it was impossible to give an answer to the Question put by the hon. and gallant Member whether the new Warrant would not in some cases reduce the net income of these officers by over £100 a-year. It depended upon the establishment of the regiment, upon the number of recruits, whether the regiment went out for training, and if so, for a long or short period. For instance, the Irish Militia did not train for several years, and therefore the emoluments of the surgeons would be very small indeed. He had already stated that it was not his intention to enter upon the consideration of this question until after the 31st December, because by that time he should know what Militia surgeons intended to accept the new terms.

THE WAR IN THE EAST.—QUESTION.

Mr. MONK asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government will take steps during the Recess, by the publication in the London Gazette (as in the case of the Brussels protocols) or otherwise, to supply such information respecting the war in the East, or negotiations for peace, as would be presented to Parliament during the Session?

Mr. DISRAELI: I believe it has always been the custom during the Recess to keep the country well informed of important events, either in war or diplomacy; and I see no reason why that custom should be departed from.

CRIMINAL LAW—DIETARY OF MILLBANK PRISON.—QUESTION.

Mr. ROWLEY HILL (for Sir Edward Watkin) asked the Secretary of

State for the Home Department, Whether the dietary now in force for Military prisoners in Millbank Prison has been brought under his consideration; and, whether it is the fact, that the dietary and discipline of Military prisoners at Millbank has within the last two years been modified by the governor, on the advice of the surgeon, in above a thousand cases?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that the scale of dietary in force for military prisoners in the prison referred to by the hon. Member was brought under his consideration in June last, and that, in conjunction with the Directors of Prisons, he had ordered it to be altered. It was therefore different now in some material points from the dietary in force at the time referred to by the hon. Member. The matter was still under consideration, and he would see what further modifications were necessary.

ARMY—CASE OF LIEUTENANT WALKER.—QUESTION.

Mr. GIBSON asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is true that Lieutenant R. F. Walker, 30th Regiment, died on the 8th of July 1876 in consequence of injuries received in consequence of a fall from his horse whilst acting as A.D.C. to Sir Thomas M'Mahon during a cavalry field-day at Aldershot on the 28th of June 1876; whether the fall was not occasioned by Lieutenant Walker's horse putting his forelegs in a concealed drain without any default on the rider's part; whether the War Office has not declined to pay to Lieutenant Walker the price of his commission; and, whether, under the circumstances of the case, he will make a special recommendation to have the whole or some part of the price of Lieutenant Walker's commission paid to his family?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, it was unfortunately true that Lieutenant Walker died in consequence of a fall from his horse at Aldershot without any default on his part. The War Office had no power to pay to the family of Lieutenant Walker the price of his commission, and the Army Purchase Commission, acting under an Act of Parliament, had no power to do so. Any special recommendation from him on the subject would, therefore, be useless.

ARMY—COMMISSION ON RETIREMENT AND PROMOTION.—QUESTIONS.

Captain NOLAN asked the Secretary of State for War, If a portion of the press were furnished with or had obtained copies of the Report of the Commissioners on Retirement and Promotion in the Army, at a date on which no copy, manuscript or printed, of such Report was accessible to Members; and, if steps can be taken to prevent Members from being again placed at a similar disadvantage?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, that the Report of the Royal Commission was addressed to the Queen, and not to that House. He had promised that the Report should be in the hands of Members as soon as possible. Only a limited number of copies could be at first obtained, and when he was applied to, to allow the publication of the Report in the Press he thought that as the public took so much interest in the matter, there could be no objection to publicity being given to it. He had only taken the usual course in such matters. He could not lay the Report by itself on the Table; but the whole of the Report and appendices would be laid on the Table on or before Saturday next.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether a certain number of copies of the Report of the Royal Commission on Promotion and Retirement in the Army have been distributed to the London press in print, while none are in possession of Members of the House; and, if so, what prevented the printing of copies to be furnished to Members of the House at the same time as to the press?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the full number of copies could not be distributed in the time proposed. The Report alone had been allowed to be printed in the newspapers, and hon. Members were thus made acquainted with the recommendations made to Her Majesty quite as soon as the public.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—HALIFAX VICARAGE—VICAR'S RATE.

QUESTION.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the inhabitants of Halifax are still under an obligation to pay the Vicar's

Rate; and, if so, what steps the Government intend to take in regard to this matter?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, there was no doubt that so long as the Act of 1829 remained unrepealed the inhabitants of Halifax were legally responsible for the payment of the Vicar's Rate. The Government were not prepared to surrender, without any *quid pro quo*, that portion of the rate levied on houses, amounting to £970 a-year. In order to show that the Government were desirous of compromising the matter, they would consent to repeal the Act on condition that £11,600—12 years' purchase—was contributed by voluntary subscriptions and paid over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in respect of the rate on houses. The Government were of opinion that, when the inhabitants compared this settlement of the question with their position under the Act of 1829, they would be disposed to take advantage of the opportunity afforded to them.

HARBOURS OF REFUGE—DOVER.

QUESTION.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If, before giving final sanction to more public money for Dover, he will afford time and opportunities for the many authorities along our exposed sea coasts to petition against spending or lending any more public money for attempting to form a Military and Naval Harbour at Dover until the many other and urgently needed Harbours are provided for our commerce, for fishings, and for refuge?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that if the Government decided on proceeding with a Bill next Session for the improvement of the harbour of Dover, it would be the duty of the Government to give public notices in November. There would, therefore, be ample time and opportunity for any persons to petition against the Bill if they should desire to do so.

PHŒNIX PARK, DUBLIN.—QUESTIONS.

MR. BUTT asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he is aware that the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland have inserted in the public papers an advertisement proposing to let for a term of at least seventy-five years Whitefield Lodge and grounds, which are stated in the advertisement to form a portion of the north end of the Phœnix Park, and to contain about three acres of land; whether he will explain the circumstances under which this alienation of a portion of the Phœnix Park is proposed; and, whether the sanction of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has been given to the proposal?

MR. CALLAN: Before the hon. Gentleman answers the Question, I should like to ask whether his attention has been called to the fact that some portion of the property has been let out for milch cows?

MR. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, he was aware that the Office of Works in Dublin proposed to let Whitefield House. It had been formerly the residence of the late bailiff of the Park, who had a salary of £250 a-year, and it was considered advisable to provide for his successor a more suitable residence. He would inquire whether the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown had been taken in the matter, but he believed the transaction had met the full approval of the Irish Government. He would inform himself further as to the affair, and would afterwards communicate with the hon. Member.

INDIA MUSEUM.—QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he is prepared to give an assurance to the House that no arrangement shall be entered into during the Recess which will throw upon India any permanent charge for the erection or maintenance of an Indian Museum in London?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, in reply, said, that the Government of India had entered into a temporary arrangement for the exhibition of the Indian Museum at South Kensington which would not terminate until Christmas, and between now and next Session no arrangement would be made which would throw upon India any portion of the expense of the Indian Museum.

CRIMINAL LAW (IRELAND)—TRIAL OF CLAFFEY.—QUESTION.

MR. CALLAN asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether a second counsel had been assigned by the Crown, and feed by the Treasury, for the defence of the prisoners Burke at Nenagh, Moore at Maryborough, and Montgomery at Omagh; and, whether his attention has been called to the circumstances under which the prisoner Claffey is now for a fourth time to stand his trial at Tullamore, and considering that the trial at last assizes proved abortive, through no default of the prisoner, he will advise that both the counsel hitherto defending the prisoner be assigned by the Crown to defend him at the adjourned assizes to be held on Wednesday next?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. PLUNKET): As far as I have been able to ascertain, the facts with regard to the prisoners Burke and Montgomery, set forth in the Question of the hon. Gentleman, are accurately stated by him. As to the second portion of the hon. Gentleman's Question, I am informed that the Attorney General for Ireland has authorized the appointment of two counsel to defend the prisoner Claffey, and I believe that the same able counsel who previously appeared will be at his service again.

CRIMINAL LAW—POLICE AT PLYMOUTH.—QUESTION.

MR. HOPWOOD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the circumstances detailed in a Letter, dated the 2nd day of August, from a Mr. William Glasson, addressed to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, complaining of the conduct of Inspector Anniss, of the Metropolitan Police, now acting in the neighbourhood of Plymouth and Devonport under the Contagious Diseases Acts, 1866 and 1869, accusing that officer of arresting, questioning indecently, and threatening a highly respectable young lady at Mutley, near Plymouth, on the night of the 26th of July; whether Captain Harris on being complained to did not on the 5th of August reply to the complaints—

> "I have the Reports now before me, and from these I gathered that Inspector Anniss was not near the place named on the day in question. It is quite evident to me that some person must have personated Inspector Anniss (probably an Agent of the Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal Association), as I have the testimony of many persons that Inspector Anniss was on the Hoe at the time named.
>
> "I fear you have fallen into bad hands.
>
> (Signed) "WILM. C. HARRIS,
> "Assistant Commr."

whether such an answer will be considered by him decorous and satisfactory; and, whether under all the circumstances he will not cause an independent inquiry to be made into the facts?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: My attention was called to the letter of Mr. Glasson, and I immediately directed the ordinary inquiries to be made in the usual course. I regret to find that the letter quoted by the hon. Member has been written by Captain Harris. I think it very injudicious, and I am sorry he should have written it. With regard to the case itself, I have only received this afternoon the full reports on the conduct of the police. They are of considerable length, and I am unable at present to form any opinion on the matter. I think it right to say that the Inspector denies, in the most positive manner, the truth of the statement from beginning to end. He says he was not at the place mentioned, and knows nothing about the matter. I am not quite certain whether the proper course would not be to leave the matter to the ordinary tribunals of the country, so that the charge may be tried in open court before the magistrates. Should this be done, I shall give every facility in my power to have the matter properly investigated, and I think that such a course would be more satisfactory than a private inquiry.

NAVY—VESTMENTS OF NAVY CHAPLAINS.—QUESTION.

MR. HOLT asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been called to the circumstances that, by a judgment of the Dean of Arches, it has been declared to be unlawful for clergymen of the Church of England to wear a vestment called a "stole;" whether chaplains in the Navy are not bound by that decision; and, whether the Admiralty will take steps to enforce the observance of the Law as thus declared by chaplains in the Navy?

MR. HUNT: My hon. Friend alludes, I presume, to the Purchas Case, in which a decision was given that it was unlawful for the defendant to wear a stole. A very high authority has, however, given his opinion officially that chaplains may wear stoles. In his address to the chaplains of the Army in 1867, the Chaplain General used these words—

> "Being chaplains appointed by the Sovereign, you are each of you entitled to wear a plain black stole or scarf with your surplice."

This address has been made a circular by the War Office, and though part of the instructions contained in it have been revoked in consequence of the Purchas judgment, the passage relating to stoles remains in force. I cannot, therefore, look upon the matter as free from doubt.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—QUESTIONS.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT inquired when the Papers respecting Bulgaria would be in the hands of hon. Members?

MR. BOURKE said, that on learning that it was the intention of the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Ashley) to call the attention of the House to the subject of the atrocities, he had arranged for the printing of Papers, and 50 copies would be in the hands of the Librarian of the House by 9 o'clock that evening.

MR. W. E. FORSTER asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposed to have a Morning Sitting tomorrow?

MR. DISRAELI: I think it will be convenient for both sides of the House if we meet to-morrow at 3 o'clock. The third reading of the Appropriation Bill will be the first Order.

In reply to Mr. GOSCHEN,

MR. DISRAELI said, that if the minor measures put down on the Paper took up too much time to allow of a full discussion on the Indian Budget that night, he would move the Adjournment of the Debate.

THE EXTRADITION TREATY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

OBSERVATIONS.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, with reference to the Resolution he had on the Paper with respect to the Extradition Treaty with the United States, that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had promised him a day to bring it on after the Merchant Shipping Bill had been disposed of. He had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman had done all he could in the matter; but on the day that was offered he could scarcely expect to engage the attention of the House, and should therefore, although very unwillingly, postpone the Motion. If diplomacy had not meanwhile settled the question, he would bring it forward early next Session.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Issue of £28,703,043 out of the Consolidated Fund).

MR. BUTT said, he did not wish to detain the Committee, but he confessed that he should like to have some little more explanation than had yet been given with regard to the question which had been brought before the House by the hon. Member for the City of Dublin with regard to the distribution of advertisements among the newspapers. In olden times the giving of Government advertisements——

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is not in Order in calling attention to this subject on this clause.

MR. BUTT said, the clause included every Vote of money, and included the very Vote for this money. He apprehended that put him in Order; if not, he would wait until they came to another clause. But he apprehended this clause appropriated the whole money for the year, and unquestionably the money paid for advertising. He believed he was in Order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Question has not yet been put—I put this clause to stand part of the Bill. If the hon. and learned Member wishes to proceed now it is an unusual course. It would lead to much discussion if any item of expenditure were to be discussed while the clause is in this position. The more usual practice is to raise questions of this description before going into Committee.

MR. BUTT said, that even if there was an appearance of his being out of Order, it was owing to the new form in which the Appropriation Bill was framed. Surely he would be at liberty to proceed in a clause under which the money whose expenditure he wished to criticize was being appropriated. In the olden time these advertisements were a sort of subsidy to the Press. There were some curious passages in Lord Castlereagh's despatches as to the uses which were made of newspapers; but he thought they ought to establish the principle, and also to act upon it, that the advertisements should be inserted in papers for the sake of attracting public attention, and not for the sake of subsidizing any paper. It was obvious that was not the case now; but he believed that advertisements were given as a matter of favour, according to a list prepared by some persons at head-quarters. He did not complain of this Government in particular, but of all Governments; and he did think the time had come when they should abandon the practice he had referred to, and when advertisements should be put in the papers for the sake of publicity only, and not for the sake of the support they gave to the current Administration, and those advertisements should not be withdrawn because the paper did not support them. He should like to have some assurance that the bad practice would be abandoned, and that abandonment would be another addition to the good changes which the present Government had founded. If not, he should take an opportunity next early Session of bringing the matter before the House.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I fear I can give no more information then I did yesterday. As a matter of fact, the only advertisements over which I have control are those which are issued from the Chief Secretary's Office, and those are inserted in *The Freeman's Journal.* I do not control the advertisements issued by the War Department or other Departments, and that is all the information I can give.

Mr. BUTT said, his observations were not directed to the right hon. Baronet's Department in particular, but he complained of the general system.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR thought a Return ought to be laid on the Table of the newspapers to which Government advertisements were sent. There was no difficulty in furnishing that information, for a list of all the newspapers usually appeared in the Circular Orders of the Army, and if he did not err, a list had just appeared in the recent Army Circulars, which hon. Members could buy. No doubt, the political Party in power did vary the lists of newspapers in which Government advertisements could be inserted, but all the power rested with the Treasury. It had been, and still was, a petty political kind of bribery, which both political sides should now repudiate. Both Parties favoured their respective newspaper advocates; and if the Liberal papers received more advertisements than the newspapers which supported the Conservative side, it was because the newspapers were in general more numerous than those of the other side. It was, however, a paltry affair, and injurious to the public interests, for notices should be sent to papers which could give the greatest circulation.

Mr. J. COWEN said, that fortunately or otherwise he was a newspaper proprietor, and so far as his experience went it was exactly the contrary of what the Chief Secretary had stated to be the custom. He believed it was notorious that when the Whigs came into Office they had a lot of papers to which they gave their advertisements, and when the Tories were in office they gave their advertisements to others. It was a most objectionable practice, and was derogatory to the Press. Government put their advertisements in the papers for the purpose of selling their wares or getting what they wanted. Their object should be to bring their intimations well before the public. This principle was not acted upon. He knew newspapers in this country that had been almost entirely supported by subsidies got from Government. He could not speak exactly as to the figures; but he believed there was something like £50,000 paid for advertisements in the year, and a great proportion went when the Conservatives were in Office to the Conservative newspapers, and when the Liberals were in Office to the Liberal newspapers. As an instance of the absurdity of this practice, he found a Government advertisement for iron ware in a paper in the North of Scotland, with a circulation of about 400 copies; and he had seen advertisements in papers on the West Coast of England for Newcastle coals. This was not done for publicity, but for the support of Party newspapers. There were some papers which, like certain politicians, took their colour from the atmosphere around them; but these were exceptional, while what he had stated was an absolute fact, that Conservative Governments gave their advertisements to Conservative newspapers, and Liberal Governments gave theirs to Liberal newspapers, utterly irrespective of what was required in the interests of the nation.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 2 and 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Treasury may, in certain cases of exigency, authorize expenditure unprovided for; provided that the aggregate grants for the navy services and for the army services respectively be not exceeded).

MR. MONK moved that the clause should be so amended as to provide that Notice should be given to Parliament within 10 days of the appropriation of money by the Treasury in cases of emergency to any of the public services of the country.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR pointed out that the defects of the clauses in the Appropriation Act had already been under the notice of the House, and Notice of the changes needed therein had already been given, and as he had understood from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, an inquiry would be granted next Session, in order to remedy the kind of shortcomings by the spending Departments, which had been brought before the House, in the case of the naval expenditure, the Admiralty having largely exceeded the estimated sums without the permission or knowledge of the Treasury.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER thought the suggestion an important one, but urged that its consideration should be postponed until next Session.

MR. CHILDERS suggested that the whole subject should be referred to the Public Accounts Committee.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, his intention was to deal with the question in the way suggested by the right hon. Gentleman.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment, to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, in rising to move that the Speaker leave the Chair to go into Committee on East India Revenue Accounts, explained that he had taken this somewhat unusual course in consequence of the number of Amendments which had been placed upon the Paper, and with a view of making one continuous statement upon the many subjects included in an Indian Budget. The figures which would come under the consideration of the House to-night were those connected with the revenue and expenditure of the financial years 1874-5, 1875-6, and 1876-7. The estimates for the two earlier years had already been brought under the notice of the House, but those of the last had not. He proposed to take first the ordinary expenditure of the three years to which he referred, and then to add to it the extraordinary expenditure upon public works; and, finally, to make some observations as to the effect of the fall in the value of silver upon the general revenue and expenditure of the country.

In the financial year 1874-5 the Budget estimate of Indian revenue was placed at £48,984,000, and the expenditure at £50,580,000, showing an estimated deficit of £1,388,000, but this deficit arose from the famine expenditure of £2,580,000. According to the regular estimate the revenue for the year would have been £50,070,400, and the expenditure would have been £50,564,000, leaving a deficit of £494,000. The actual revenue, however, was £50,570,171, against an actual expenditure of £50,250,974, showing an actual surplus of £319,197. There was thus an actual result better by £1,707,197 than the Budget estimate. This was due to an increase under nearly every head of revenue and to a postponement of certain famine charges, the surplus, excluding the famine charges, being over £2,500,000.

Comparing the finances of the year 1874-5 with those of the preceding year, he found that the revenue showed an increase of £971,918, while there was a decrease in the expenditure of £1,154,947, which was due to reduced famine charges, the net revenue from salt being increased by £92,716, and being better than the Budget estimate for 1874-5 by £176,000, notwithstanding the abolition of 800 miles of the Customs line.

Coming to the year 1875-6, he had to announce a still more gratifying result. The revenue for that year was estimated in the Budget at £49,820,000, against an estimated expenditure of £49,314,000, showing an estimated surplus of £506,000; according to the regular estimate the revenue would have been £50,994,872, against an expenditure of £49,751,373, showing a surplus of £1,243,499; but from recent telegrams it appeared that the revenue for the year was now estimated at £51,254,872, against an expenditure of £49,620,373, showing a surplus of £1,634,499. The surplus would have been considerably more had not a famine charge amounting to £656,587 been postponed from the previous year. The net result of the gross famine expenditure was, for the year 1873-4, £3,864,673, leaving a deficit of £1,807,668; for the year 1874-5, £2,237,860, when there was a surplus of £319,197; and for the year 1875-6, £656,587, when there was an estimated surplus of £1,634,499. There was thus a famine expenditure of £6,700,000 in three years, with a surplus of £150,000, or, exclusive of that expenditure, an annual surplus during those three years of £2,300,000. This was a convincing proof of the elasticity of the revenue of India, and compared favourably with the result of the Irish Famine, in which case, out of a total expenditure of £10,000,000, only £2,000,000 was paid out of revenue. The revenue for 1875-6, according to the recent advices, showed a considerable increase as compared with the Budget estimate under nearly every head and the increase, exclusive of opium, amounted to about £1,000,000. The Budget estimates had been high, and the Customs loss by the Tariff Act was estimated for the financial year at £266,000, the estimated annual loss being £300,000, the Act having been passed in the middle of the financial year. In place of that loss, however, it is now estimated that the Customs revenue will exceed the Budget estimate by £35,000. There had also been an increase in the revenue from salt and stamps.

There was one circumstance to which he particularly desired to call attention. When the Prince of Wales's visit to India was first mentioned in that House, certain hon. Members had objected to it on the ground of the expense it would entail upon the country. One result of the visit, however, had been that it had brought a considerable amount of revenue into the Indian Exchequer in the following way:—There had been a great reluctance on the part of all classes of the Natives of India to use the railways, but they had overcome that reluctance in their anxiety to see the Prince of Wales, and a very large number of them, having once overcome their prejudices in that respect, would appreciate the advantages which the railways afforded, with gratifying results to the revenue in future years to be derived from the lines.

In estimating the receipts for this year the Indian Government had to take into consideration the growth of the revenue during the past two years as well as during the preceding years. He had been a little surprised the other day to receive a pamphlet entitled *The Indian Budget for* 1876, by Mr. John Dacosta, to which he should not have referred had it not been for its remarkable preface, in which it was sought to be shown that the Indian finances were not so flourishing as they had been represented to be. Attached to that pamphlet were many distinguished names —such as Sir George Campbell, Mr. M'Arthur, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Richard, and others, some of whom he was not aware had given much attention to the subject of Indian finance. The last name on the list, however, fully explained the fact. It was that of Mr. Chesson, the Secretary of the Aborigines Protection Society; and it would therefore appear that the gentlemen who had signed the pamphlet, being also members of that society, had signed it in that capacity. This circumstance, perhaps, accounted for the nature of the statements in that pamphlet, which certainly appeared to be somewhat aboriginal. It was rather a serious matter for a large number of Gentlemen occupying a Parliamentary position to attach their signatures to a statement to the effect that the Indian revenue was not so flourishing as it had been represented to be by the Government, and that, owing to continued pressure, it had lost its elasticity. These Gentlemen, however, appeared to have compared the revenue of one year with that of another without in the slightest degree taking into account the reduction which had been made in the taxation, which was the same thing as though they were to assert that the Income Tax in this country had lost its elasticity because a 3*d*. tax now did not produce as much as a 6*d*. tax a year back. The two years in which the revenue was the highest hitherto known were the years 1869-70 and 1870-1. In 1869-70 the revenue amounted to £50,901,081, while in 1870-1 it amounted to £51,413,686. In 1875-6 it is estimated at £51,254,872. But in the years 1869-70 and 1870-1 the Income Tax was in operation, bringing in in 1869-70 £1,110,224, and in 1870-1 £2,072,025. Other receipts not now included in the statements of revenue, but transferred to the Local Governments towards meeting charges for Provincial Services, amounted in 1869-70 and 1870-1 to £647,000, and in 1869-70 exceptional items to the amount of £850,000 were included under Land Revenue and Miscellaneous. If the Income Tax, which had since been remitted, and these exceptional receipts were deducted from the revenue of the two earlier years it would be found that taxes which in 1869-70 produced £48,300,000, and in 1870-1 £48,700,000, gave last year an estimated revenue of £51,254,872.

From 1865-6 to 1874-5 the growth of revenue under the heads of Land Revenue, Excise, Customs, Salt, and Stamps was £3,186,948—an annual increase of over £300,000. The increase of revenue under all heads in 1874-5 over 1873-4 was £972,000, and in 1875-6, according to the most recent estimate, £682,000, or £1,654,000 in the two years. The Budget estimate was exceeded by £1,600,000 in 1874-5, and by £1,440,000 in 1875-6. For 1876-7 the Budget estimate of revenue is £50,480,000, and of expenditure £50,336,000, showing a surplus of £144,000. The expenditure is £584,000 more than was estimated in the regular estimate for 1875-6. The loss by exchange is estimated at £2,332,000, being an increase of £907,000. The old rule was that there should be a surplus of £500,000; but in the present year the Secretary of State did not feel justified in increasing taxation to meet the very exceptional loss caused by the fall in the value of silver. If it had not been fo the heavy expenditure there would have been a surplus of £1,000,000. The revenue showed considerable increase in several items. The increase on Excise was due more to efficient administration than to increased consumption. There had been a considerable increase in Stamps. The receipts from State railways were, in 1874-5, £130,986; in 1875-6, they are estimated at £277,000; and in 1876-7 at £415,000. Customs are this year taken low—at less by £85,000. That is a cautious estimate, as we had last year remitted certain duties under the Tariff Act.

A change of Viceroy had occurred since the Budget had been issued. There was no part of Lord Northbrook's administration that reflected more credit on him than that which related to the Army. When Lord Mayo went out to India he at once commenced retrenchment in Army expenditure. Indian Army expenditure might be divided into two heads—that which occurred in India, and that which occurred in England. Lord Mayo began the reform in India, and being a great master of detail, Lord Northbrook pushed it further. In 1869-70 the Army in India cost £12,800,000, and in England £3,500,000, and in 1876-7 it was estimated at £11,800,000 in India, and £4,000,000 in England. A considerable additional expense had been thrown on the Army charges, for there was an increase to the English soldiers' pay of £285,000, and to Native Regiments of £300,000. Yet this additional charge had been met by *boná fide* retrenchments, which had stood the test of time, and which left the efficiency of the Army unimpaired and the expenditure reduced. The English side was not so satisfactory, although it was abnormally swollen this year by certain commutations of pensions, which would give great ultimate relief. Two systems of recruiting, the long and the short service, had been tried in the past, and at the present moment we were hit by both. That portion of the long service pension, to which soldiers of 21 years were entitled, and for which India was liable, would annually increase for some few years; the establishments of European soldiers having been largely increased to stamp out the Mutiny. By the short service system, initiated by Lord Cardwell, pensions were practically abolished, but the cost of recruiting establishments was largely increased, and they were now paying that increase, without being rid of the burden of pensions. Those Army charges would not decrease. India was a poor country, whilst England was a very rich country. India wanted English soldiers, and wanting them she must pay, not her own market price, but the price of the labour market of the country from which they came. The Secretary of War had constantly had this matter under his consideration, and if there had not been perfect agreement between him and the India Office upon all the details of his proposals, that was due not to any want of harmony between the two Offices, but to the difficulty of reconciling the fundamental principle of the short service system, the establishment of a reserve, with the requirements of India, a cheap and continuous supply of British soldiers.

Having now placed the results of the revenue and ordinary expenditure of the last three years, he would pass on to the public works extraordinary. No part of the expenditure of the Indian Government was the subject of fiercer contention. To rightly appreciate the action of that Government their position a few years back should be considered. They felt bound to give India the benefits of a railway system, for the indirect advantages of rapid communication to a great Government were enormous. A rapid concentration of military force being possible in times of emergency, permanent reductions in time of peace and quiet could be effected as well as economies in civil administration. But private enterprize refused unaided to undertake these works; Government was compelled to give a guarantee, and this system proving very expensive was abolished during Lord Lawrence's Viceroyalty. In 1873, before we came into Office, a resolution was published by the Indian Government, by which the Government proposed to entirely substitute the principle of direct agency for that of the indirect agency of the Guaranteed Companies, and for that purpose they proposed to spend annually for the next five years £4,500,000; £3,000,000 on State Railways, and £1,500,000 upon Canals. This sum was limited last year to £4,000,000. This expenditure was estimated to throw no fresh annual charges upon the revenues of India, the increased returns from works in operation balancing the interests of the loans borrowed. The opponents of the system said that it might be sound in theory, but it was not sound in practice; that, as a matter of fact, the Indian Government constructed works which did not pay interest on borrowed money, and that the liabilities were annually increasing without a corresponding increase of revenue. This was an assertion which it was easy to test, and he would compare two periods within Lord Northbrook's administration—the year 1872-3 and the year 1876-7. The expenditure upon public works extraordinary from 1872-3 to 1876-7 was £17,893,000, and the amount borrowed £14,683,000, the difference between the two being mainly made up by surpluses of ordinary revenue over ordinary expenditure. The charge for interest in 1872-3 was £5,857,458; the loss on the guaranteed railways did not amount to more than £2,110,501; and the State railways were worked at a loss of £5,500—making a total of £7,973,459; but the irrigation works gave a return of £413,535, which reduced the total charge on that year to £7,559,924. In 1876-7 the charge for interest was £5,750,000; the loss on guaranteed railways was £1,260,000; the State railways worked at a profit of £118,000, and the irrigation works yielded £527,000; the two making together £645,000, which, deducted from £7,010,000, the total for interest and guaranteed railways, left a net charge on the revenues of £6,365,000. In other words, although the debt was increased by £14,683,000, the loss to the revenue was £1,200,000 less. The redemption of the old East India Stock in 1873 effected an annual saving of £450,000 under the head of interest; against this, however, might be put the whole of the irrigation returns of Madras and Bombay, which, being indirect, he had not included in this comparison.

It must be remembered that the climates of India differed as much as that of the North of Scotland from the South of Italy. In certain parts of India there was no rain whatever, and in the Punjab and Sindh and other places cultivation was impossible without water. It would be found that the expenditure on irrigation paid where there was little or no rain; and only where there was much rain in the course of the year were the results unsatisfactory. In the Punjab the amount expended was nearly £3,000,000, and the return was 4½ per cent. This was a somewhat severe test to apply, because the capital included all the money expended on works that were not yet in operation, and of course it was only those in operation that paid any interest. In the North-West Provinces there was a similar return of 4½ per cent. In Bengal, which included the Orissa works and some not yet in operation, the irrigation works involved a loss of 2½ per cent. The Madras and Bombay accounts were not passed as reliable by the Indian Government, inasmuch as there was some difficulty in ascertaining the exact increase of land revenue due to irrigation; but an account which he thought fairly reliable showed a return of 16 per cent in Madras and 15 per cent in Bombay. The State railways were paying well, as they were constructed under far more favourable conditions than others. They had cost £4,300 per mile without the Agra Bridge, in Rajpootana, and £5,300 per mile with it, as against £16,000 per mile; and therefore a return of £200 per mile repaid the interest on the capital borrowed at 4 per cent, while the guaranteed railways would require a return of £800 per mile to pay 5 per cent on their borrowed capital. We were, therefore, now constructing railways under far more favourable conditions than before.

It was only natural that there should be great objection felt in this country to any Government borrowing money for reproductive works. It was contrary to the financial policy of this country, where we had always found private capitalists ready to undertake public works, and this objection had been somewhat confirmed by the recent example of Turkey and other Eastern Countries, which had borrowed large sums ostensibly in order to extend their public works, but had made other applications of the money. It did not by any means follow that if the system were honestly carried out it would not give good results. We had spent large sums in India, and the question often asked was—What had we got for our money? If our property were put up for sale in the market would it realize anything like what we had expended upon it? The capital expended upon public works which were in any way connected with the Government was £125,000,000, of which £14,000,000 was spent on State railways, £17,000,000 on irrigation works, and £94,000,000 was guaranteed capital; and we found that this property had now brought in a net revenue in working receipts of £4,296,000; of which £118,000 was from the State railways, £708,000 from irrigation works, and £3,470,000 on account of the guaranteed capital. The State railway system was still in its infancy; the receipts were increasing; it was hoped that by careful management the working expenses could be reduced, and that in a short time the net revenue would be over £5,000,000. Therefore we had got a revenue of £4,300,000, annually increasing, and if we were to go into the market the property would probably realize not far short of what we had expended upon it. To give one instance of how working expenses might be reduced, he might mention that the cost of fuel per mile upon the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was six times what it was on the East Indian Railway, which was able to work coalfields, and when the Great Indian Peninsula worked coal, which it hoped to be able to do shortly, it would probably pay the guaranteed interest.

The Secretary of State the first year he was in office laid down three principles as to public works; none were to be undertaken but those which would pay interest on borrowed capital; those that would not be remunerative were to be constructed out of Revenue, and loans were to be raised in India for public works. The Indian Government had last year substituted a somewhat different principle — namely, that India could afford to lose annually a certain sum upon these public works, but the Secretary of State had re-affirmed his instructions of 1874, as he could not recognize the principle that because some works were more remunerative than had been expected, the surplus was to be employed in unremunerative works. The classification of public works in India was not perfect; but the only works which were now included under the head of "extraordinary" were railways and canals. He objected to placing all under one head, because it led to indifference as to the results in particular instances. He objected to any hard-and-fast line being laid down which would have the tendency to stop works, when there were large establishments open, materials purchased, and contracts made, the disregard of which might involve loss to the Indian Exchequer. He should like to see a further classification of works in the direction of handing over to the local authorities those in which they would take a greater interest when they saw they would profit by the results. The total expenditure on public works extraordinary, for three years was, or would be, as follows: — 1874-5, £4,249,571; 1875-6, £4,146,873; and 1876-7, £3,759,000; and the deficit over ordinary expenditure was £3,930,374, £2,903,374 in the second, and £3,615,000 in the third, making £10,448,748, though the amount actually spent was £12,155,444. It was necessary that the Indian Government should carry on the public works, because they were the means of increasing the wealth and prosperity of India. Some of those works might turn out to be failures, but it would be very unwise to adopt an abstract Resolution, which, if rigidly carried, would stop all public works extraordinary. At the same time, he could not agree with those who ignored this extraordinary expenditure. It was a component part of the Indian financial system, and the outlay for this purpose must mainly depend on the condition of the Indian Exchequer.

The expenditure for this year, including the public works extraordinary, having exceeded the revenue, it was necessary to raise a loan. Sir William Muir estimated that £360,000 would be received from Holkar and Scindia, and the Government would raise a loan of £2,640,000 at home. The Government actually raised a loan of £4,000,000, which it was assumed would be necessary to meet the ordinary expenditure of the year. That, however, was an error. The loan of that amount had been raised because it was not advisable to force the Government bills on the silver market, and the difference would be found in the increased cash balances at the end of the year, and did not represent any additional burden thrown on Indian finance, because the Government would be able to buy up a considerable amount of rupee paper bearing 5½ per cent interest.

Within the last few days he had received a telegram from the Indian Government stating that the Viceroy had issued circulars to the Departments urging economy and recommending a restriction of expenditure. That proceeding had been interpreted as foreshadowing an overwhelming deficit, to be met by loan, but the resolution of the Governor General in Council merely enjoined the cessation of all avoidable expenditure. Various telegrams had appeared in the newspapers stating that there had been a great falling off in the revenue of India, and that the loss upon the exchange would be not less than £4,000,000. He had telegraphed to India for any fresh figures, and was told, in reply, that the resolution of the Government only referred to the loss arising from the exchanges. That resolution was only issued a few days ago, and was based upon information contained in the mail which left the silver market in a state of depression, and trade at the lowest ebb.

The only fear of deficit was from an apprehension of increased loss by exchange. So far, however, from there being a large deficit, he did not believe there would be any deficit at all. The revenue of the year had been cautiously estimated. There was an estimated falling-off in Customs and Salt, resulting naturally from the depreciation in the import trade and the working of the Tariff Act. It had also been stated, although not officially, that the opium advances would be this year considerably in excess of the amount estimated in the Budget. A certain amount of lands belonging to the Government was devoted to the cultivation of opium, and all opium produced by this land was bought by the Government. The advances made to the cultivator would be heavier than usual on account of the large crop; but any loss would be fully met by the increased opium revenue next year. If the revenue were deficient, owing to the increased opium advances, they would simply be discounting a large opium revenue next year. At the same time Lord Lytton, wishing to co-operate with the Government at home, had enjoined economy not only in the ordinary expenditure but in the extraordinary expenditure for public works. He would not, however, disguise from the House that the position of the Government of India occasioned some anxiety, because the causes which increased expenditure and decreased revenue were not in any way under their control.

He must now ask the House to carry their attention back to the commencement of the year 1876-7, at which time our revenue was in a most flourishing condition, the ordinary expenditure and the public works extraordinary were well under control, and, with one exception, everything seemed satisfactory. The one cause of anxiety was the loss by exchange produced by the fall in the value of silver. A few months back this depreciation of silver was a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, but during that period it had so rapidly grown that it now darkened and overshadowed the whole horizon of Indian finance. The fluctuations in silver were so sudden, the apprehension of all merchants trading with the East so general, that early in the Session he obtained leave to appoint a Select Committee to inquire the causes of this sudden depreciation, in order that the House might have an accurate diagnosis of the complaint. They were fortunate enough to secure the services of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen) as Chairman, and all who had read his Report must have been struck by its lucid arrangement and the immense care displayed in its preparation. No one who was not upon that Committee could have any notion of the time and trouble which the right hon. Gentleman gave to the subject, and he would refer hon. Members to the Appendix if they wished to form an idea of the mass of printed evidence which he mastered and embodied in his Report. He was, therefore, very glad to have this opportunity of publicly thanking the right hon. Gentleman for having undertaken and discharged a most onerous duty, and to assure him that the result of his labours would be of the greatest benefit both to the Home and the Indian Government in guiding their subsequent action.

He would not travel over any of the ground covered by the Report, but he should like to point out how, owing to silver being the standard of value in India, the fall of that metal affected Indian finance in a two-fold manner. The depreciation of the metallic currency of a country for all purposes of trade and commerce, especially external, was most inconvenient, but it did not follow that actual loss was inflicted upon the whole community within which the depreciated metal might have circulation. The recipients of fixed incomes and the creditors were, no doubt, injuriously affected, but, on the other hand, the self-adjusting laws of supply and demand would cause a rise in prices beneficial to the producer, while the Government of the country might be able, by raising the rates of taxation, to compensate itself for the lessened value of previous taxes. The financial position of India was, however, peculiar. About two-fifths of the income was land revenue, which, generally speaking, was fixed either permanently or for stated periods in silver. To the owners and occupiers of land, every fall in the value of a rupee in India was a gain purchased at the expense of the Government. At the same time, it must not be supposed that the purchasing power of the rupee in India was as much reduced as it was here, or that we had this year lost on every rupee of our land revenue the difference between the quoted value in London and the old normal value of the rupee. But the loss on the expenditure side was more serious. The requirements of the Indian Government necessitated at present an annual payment of about £15,000,000 sterling in this country. This gold liability had annually to be defrayed by India out of a silver revenue. Let them first consider for what purposes these annual payments were made; secondly, the different modes by which the necessary funds could be obtained; and, thirdly, the effect of each method of payment upon the exchanges between India and England. These home charges had risen during the last 20 years from £5,000,000 to £15,000,000. Superficial critics sometimes suggested that this increase was mainly due to the transfer of the Government of India from the East India Company to the Crown and to extravagance on the part of the India Office. A slight investigation of the purposes for which these payments were made at once disposed of any such notion. The East India Company was abolished in 1858. The last 20 years of its existence were the exact reverse of the first 18 years of the rule of the Crown. The first was throughout the world an epoch, if not of stagnation, at any rate one of slow progress, The latter period had been one series of progressive bounds and leaps, chiefly due to the enormous spread of railways and other improved means of communication. There were many indications that the East India Company, upon the eve of its abolition, was on the point of increasing the Home expenditure. To collect revenue and maintain order could form but a portion of the duties of any civilized Government, and the Court of Directors adopted the system of guaranteeing interest upon capital employed in constructing railways, as being the only means of rapidly giving India a railway system. Since 1856 the annual interest on these railways, all of which had to be paid in England, had risen from £400,000 to nearly £4,700,000. Again, the suppression of the Mutiny made it necessary to raise large loans in this country, the interest on which had risen from £670,000 in 1856-7 to £2,250,000 in 1876-7. The mutiny of a large portion of the Native Army and its consequent reduction in numbers, caused the employment of a much larger European army in India, the home charge for which, excluding stores, had risen in the same period from £1,291,000 to £3,158,700. Again, the greatly increased demand for stores of all kinds, especially iron, which could not at present be manufactured in India, had caused an increase under that head of from £950,000 in 1856-7 to upwards of £2,000,000 in 1876-7.

Taking, therefore, the three heads alone of Army expenditure, interest, and stores, they had an expenditure of over £12,200,000 at the present time, as against an expenditure of £3,320,000 in 1856-7. Again, there had apparently been a large increase in the superannuation charges, but that was mainly due to a change in account, by which all payments were now made "charges," and not classified, as in the days of the Court of Directors, as "remittances." So far from those charges being the result of the extravagance of the India Office, or due, as was sometimes stated, to the creation of fresh departments and offices, exactly the reverse was the case. These charges were the necessary consequence of the connection between India and England, and had arisen because India required certain articles which she could only obtain from England. The administration of the India Office had been most economical. The amount of work performed was ten times greater than it was 20 years ago, yet the office expenses had but slightly increased during that period, and if they abolished the India Office to-morrow they would only save about £200,000 a-year, and he doubted if they could substitute any agency which would as cheaply and efficiently perform the same work. As the individual members of Council had no means of publicly defending themselves against the charges which were sometimes made against them, he took the opportunity of stating that in no public office were estimates more carefully checked and more thoroughly sifted than those which passed through the hands of the Finance Committee of the India Office, and no one who knew the number of proposals and applications rejected, in proportion to those which were sanctioned, could assert that the India Office was extravagant, or that these so-called home charges resulted from insufficient supervision. He could not, therefore, hold out much hope of an immediate reduction of those expenses, unless it were under the head of stores. They had written to the Indian Government suggesting that whenever it was feasible they should be purchased in India. A certain portion of these stores were for public works extraordinary, and if that class of work were curtailed a saving at home might be effected. From time to time, as the loans raised here and the arrangements made with the guaranteed companies came under revision, they hoped to obtain more favourable terms, and from time to time to effect certain economies; but, as he had shown, the great mass of the home expenditure lay outside the direct control of the Secretary of State, and he could not, therefore, hold out much hope of its immediate reduction.

Having considered the purposes for which these charges were imposed, he would next consider how they were met. The whole of those disbursements had to be paid in gold, and that gold could only be obtained either by loans in England, or by remittances from or bills upon India. The capital of the railway guaranteed companies was practically a loan raised for the construction of railways in India, and the whole of that capital, amounting to £96,000,000, was paid to the credit of the Secretary of State in London; and the Secretary of State undertook to place to the credit of the companies such sums as remained over and above the payments made in England for stores and other purposes on behalf of the companies. Instead, therefore, of requiring the Indian Government to send home the sums necessary to meet the whole of the annual disbursements of the Home Treasury, the guaranteed capital was retained here and utilized in payment of the home charges, while the Indian Government placed to the credit of the companies in India the money which they would otherwise have had to send home to meet the expenses of the Home Government. And here he would mention an incident which illustrated the immense difficulties, arising from the peculiar connection between the two countries, which those who administered Indian finance had daily to meet. In the contracts made with the railway companies 1*s.* 10*d.* was estimated to be the value of a rupee. Shortly after these contracts were made the American Civil War broke out. There was then an immense demand for Indian cotton. The rupee rose in value to 1*s.* 11*d.*, and even to 2*s.* For years they placed to the credit of the railway companies in India a rupee worth 2*s.* for every 1*s.* 10*d.* paid here. If they lost thus on the capital account they consoled themselves by reflecting on their probable gains on the revenue account, as for every rupee paid into the hands of the Government in India only 1*s.* 10*d.* was paid in London. But the demonetization of silver in Germany had depreciated silver to below 1*s.* 10*d.* the rupee, and now that they were paying the full interest upon the capital, they lost as much on the revenue account as they lost on the capital account. Yet the original arrangement was fair to India; but two unforeseen events which no one could have anticipated had impaired the otherwise advantageous bargain. In the same way all loans raised except during the Mutiny were retained here and utilized in payment of the annual disbursements of the India Office. During the whole time that these loans were being raised a two-fold process was going on. The productive power of India was becoming enormously developed by the annual expenditure of large sums upon reproductive works, while on the other hand India did not feel the counteracting effect of the increase of the disbursements in this country, which increase was mainly caused by the interest due upon the sums so expended.

The guaranteed system having come to an end in consequence of its costliness, little capital on this account had recently been paid into the hands of the Secretary of State. When Lord Salisbury came into office he at once perceived the unwisdom of raising fresh loans in England for railways in India, and thus, owing to the abolition of the old policy of borrowing here, the full annual disbursements in this country had to be met by bills upon India. Now, how did India pay these bills, which might not unfairly be called an annual tribute from India? She paid for them by the excess of the value of her exports over her imports, and the price at which the Secretary of State's bills could be sold in London largely depended upon the condition and prosperity of Indian trade. Now, the Secretary of State's bills were payable in India in silver, and they competed with silver in the London market. If a merchant could not buy our bills he purchased silver, and *vice versâ*. During the last 20 years the balance of trade had been largely in favour of India, and she received the excess value of her exports over imports in bullion, *minus* the amount of the bills of the Secretary of State. The action of the Indian Government upon the demand for silver in India had been twofold. By the construction of railways and other useful works during the past 15 years the demand for and absorption of bullion had been largely fostered; on the other hand, the large annual remittances to England in order to pay for the interest so expended had, and especially during the last four years, since the full effect of the Home charges had been thrown upon India, largely diminished the amount of bullion otherwise due to India for the balance of trade in her favour. He was particularly anxious to impress this point upon the House, because if, on one hand, critics were disposed to point out the Home charges as the cause of the present depreciation of silver, on the other hand they could not deny that these same Home charges had during the last 20 years been the main cause of the great development of the productive power of India, by which she had thus been enabled to acquire and retain enormous amounts of bullion.

The amount of bullion retained by India during 40 years was remarkable, and especially so if they took the decades. The figures were as follow:—Surplus imports.—1835 to 1845.—Gold, £3,296,799; silver, £20,534,669; total, £23,831,468; Secretary of State's bills, £19,859,640; grand total, £43,691,108. 1845 to 1855.—Gold, £10,282,323; silver, £15,327,009; total, £25,609,402; Secretary of State's bills, £29,380,214; grand total, £54,989,616. 1855 to 1865.—Gold, £51,094,642; silver, £100,202,612; total, £151,297,254; Secretary of State's bills, £28,567,941; grand total, £179,865,195. 1865 to 1875.—Gold, £36,574,740; silver, £62,400,060; total, £98,974,800; Secretary of State's bills, £84,256,029; grand total, £183,230,829. This import of gold was curious, as little gold was in circulation. It must have been imported for hoarding or for ornaments. If such an immense amount of a precious metal, not used for coinage, was thus absorbed, they might infer that a large portion of the silver imported was retained for the same purposes, either in hoards or ornaments. India was able to acquire and absord this enormous amount of bullion from the growth of her export trade. In 1855-6 her exports were valued at £23,000,000, and the home charges at £5,000,000. In 1875-6 the exports were valued at £56,000,000, and the home charges at £15,000,000. This immense growth of the export trade, though partly due to other causes, was to a great extent the result of the growth of railways and other reproductive works. But the increase of the home charges was mainly due to the construction of these works; in other words, the growth of the purchasing power of India was the result of the increased expenditure in England.

But there were other influences quite as potent, though not so apparent as Secretary of State's bills, in counteracting the Indian demand for silver—namely, the remittances from India to England made either by private individuals or on behalf of companies, the capital of which had been raised in England and invested in India. What the amount of these annual remittances might be it was difficult to estimate, but the amount was very large, owing to the increase of English capital invested in India, as well as of the number of Europeans residing in India; and this brought him to the real difficulty of our connection with India. India was not a country in which Europeans would settle or reside permanently. Yet she required certain things which she could alone obtain in Europe. She wanted European capital, European enterprize and energy to manage that capital, while the infusion of the European element into her civil and military administration was essential for all purposes of good government. But when she had got these essentials she could not permanently retain them, for by a natural attraction the European, after a certain number of years' work, returned to his native home, carrying with him, if a private individual, the fortune he had made, or, if in Government service, the pension to which he was entitled. Thus there was a perennial drain upon the resources of India, which must, he was afraid, continue as long as the constitution of the European and the climate of India remained as they were. This was the main cause of the so-called home charges and of the heavy private remittances from India; and those who ignored this inherent drawback, arising from the peculiarity of the relations between the two countries, would never understand the main difficulty of Indian administration and finance.

The guarantee system by which railroads had mainly been constructed had been often attacked. But it was the only method at the time by which the East India Company could push the construction of railroads, and if it had not been adopted one of two things would have happened—India would have been without railways or private companies would have constructed them. The interest upon the capital of a private and unguaranteed company would have been higher than the 5 per cent which was guaranteed by Government. Thus India would have had ultimately to send home larger sums for her railways than she now did. If, however, the capital expended on all these railways and works could have been raised in India, she would have derived nothing but unmixed good from their construction. This was precisely what England was now doing. The further development of Indian trade would be unchecked by the influences to which he had alluded, and on which the Select Committee in their Report justly laid so much emphasis. The Select Committee gave so full an account of the causes that he would not stop to enumerate them, but would pass on to describe the effect of the fall of silver as shown in the exchange by the prices tendered for our bills this year. There was a rough-and-ready way of calculating the fall of silver by taking a rupee at 2*s.*, or, in other words, 24 pence or 96 farthings. Every fall, therefore, of a farthing in the value of a rupee was a depreciation of about 1 per cent. The Government sold every fortnight £700,000 worth of bills. On January 19 they obtained the full amount at considerably above 1*s.* 9*d.* the rupee. On February 2, a fortnight afterwards, their tenders were much lower both in amount and price, and they continued steadily to fall through the months of February, March, April, and May; but they could not ascertain that any fresh causes, except a certain depression of trade, had come into operation, sufficient to account for this rapid depreciation. They therefore had reason to believe this sudden fall to be due to panic. By panic he meant an excessive apprehension of certain impending influences and causes, which, though in existence, had not yet begun practically to operate. They were in a position of great difficulty. On the other hand they were reluctant to reduce the price of their bills, because they knew that such a course would increase the panic; on the other hand, they did not want to raise a loan —their only alternative if they did not sell their bills. They therefore determined only to accept low prices for their bills, when the amount tendered was large, being confident that every fall, in the then state of the market, would only lead to further depreciation in subsequent offers. They refused to sell any bills during February and March, the tenders being low in price and still lower in amount, and they reduced the amount of their allotments during April and May. To meet the deficiency so caused they raised a loan of £4,000,000, which they obtained at a considerable premium.

During the earlier months of the year they were in considerable perplexity at the India Office, not having before them the facts which were now known to the public through the Report of the Select Committee. They were therefore obliged to act upon impressions, and although borrowing in this country was, he admitted, wrong in principle, yet the facts which had since come into their possession seemed to him to be a conclusive justification of their action. The balance of trade being in favour of India, she received this balance in bullion, *minus* the amount of the bills of the Secretary of State. They sold £5,500,000 less from February to July than they did in last year. Therefore, unless there had been a great falling-off in Indian trade, £5,500,000 more bullion than was imported to India last year should have been remitted to India this year. There was a slight increase, but nothing approaching this amount. They made inquiries into the import and export trade of India, and found that during these months there had been a cessation of the annual increase of the last few years, but no general falling-off, except in the export of raw cotton. They then looked at the amounts tendered for their fortnightly drawings this year as compared with last year, and found that the contrast was extraordinary. In February and March 1875 tenders to the amount of £25,000,000 were received, during the same period in 1876 only £2,750,000. When there was demand for remittances to India the banks often tendered more than they wanted, in order to get a proportion of the allotment. Some allowance must be made for this in drawing comparisons between the two years. But, startling as was the falling-off in amount, the fall in price was even more curious. In January the rupee was 1*s.* 9¼*d.*; on July 5, a period of less than six months, it was 1*s.* 6½*d.*, being a fall of 11 per cent; on Thursday last, less than a month from July 5, the rupee was sold at 1*s.* 7⅝*d.*, being a rise of 4½ per cent; and yesterday they sold a small amount of bills at 1*s.* 8¼*d.*, being a rise of 7 per cent in a month. Yet during this period no fresh influences were brought to bear upon the silver market. The American production had not affected Europe, the imports of silver to England being considerably less during the last 12 months than during preceding years, while the actual amount of silver bullion in London was so small that on several occasions demands had to be supplied from abroad. These extraordinary fluctuations could not but be the result of a panic, especially as the price of Indian produce had not risen, and as he knew that in more than one instance the margin between the sold price of the rupee in London and its purchasing power in India enabled merchants buying Indian produce to realize a handsome profit. Although the raising of a loan would hereafter increase home expenditure, yet, recollecting that the whole of Indian trade was influenced by any action which the Home Government might take, and consequently the Customs revenue as well as the railway receipts, they did not feel justified in forcing down the exchanges in a panic-struck market.

The exchanges between England and India were upon a different footing from the exchanges between England and any other country. During times of depressed trade, if little business was done, the amount of the indebtedness of the two transacting countries remained practically unchanged and the exchange rested *in statu quo.* But they drew every fortnight for the amount of £700,000 upon India, and unless there was some counteracting business done in India, the sale of their bills must unduly force down the exchange against India. The depression of Indian trade due to natural causes became, through fear of German silver, nothing less than paralysis during the last few months. They did not feel justified in maintaining this paralysis. The withdrawal of their bills had already had a most salutary effect. Merchants and traders had plucked up courage, and, as the purchasing power of the rupee in India had never fallen to the London quotation, a great stimulus would be given to the export trade from India, which could not fail to raise the price of silver and enable them more easily to obtain the sums necessary for the remaining payments of the year. Finding that prices had not risen in India, and that the export trade would, therefore, be stimulated, they had requested the Viceroy to endeavour to advance bills upon Indian produce, as an easier mode of remittance. Whether the Indian Government would be able to carry out this suggestion he could not say, but the subject was under their consideration at the present moment.

The Government had been severely blamed for not taking the market rate of the price of silver. But would any one contend that in daily fluctuations as sudden as he had shown them to be the market price could fairly be ascertained? Owing to the very peculiar circumstances of the year, for months it was not the price of silver which regulated their bills, but their bills which regulated the price of silver. Who were the critics who awarded blame? They were persons interested in remitting to India. The banks doing exchange business with India were their great customers. They were a mutual convenience one to the other; but in one point their interests were antagonistic. The Government wanted to sell their bills at as high a rate as they could; the banks wanted to buy them at as low a rate as possible. If, therefore, they had been blamed, it was by those who, failing to buy rupees at the rate they wished, were forced to employ some other form of remittance less advantageous to themselves.

Perhaps the most curious feature in the whole of these operations was the small supply of silver in London. Any demand for silver raised the price, as the supply had on several occasions to be obtained from abroad. It was suggested, also, that they should fix a minimum for their bills during a certain period. But such an arrangement would have been most unfair to the Indian Government, for the only result would have been a tendency to make all tenders shave the minimum, and if, owing to any fluctuation, silver had fallen below that minimum, they would have been left without customers. The loss upon exchange was estimated to be £2,300,000. During the earlier months they realized rupees at a rate rather above that estimated. During the last two months the rate had been considerably lower. On the other hand, the loan was in excess of the sum mentioned in the Budget, and the Government would therefore draw for less during the financial year. It was impossible to estimate with perfect accuracy what the loss by exchange would be, as it depended upon the individual drawings, and silver might fluctuate as unaccountably during the remainder of the year as it did during the earlier part. He estimated that they might lose £2,800,000, or about £500,000 more than was estimated. He did not, however, contemplate a deficit. Our surplus was estimated at £144,000. The interest on the loan raised here over and above the amount estimated in India would be counterbalanced by the rupee-paper which the Indian Government had brought. The Customs and Salt for the first four months of the year had fallen off, as might have been expected from the depressed condition of the import trade. That trade was reviving, and both these items of revenue would be resuscitated, for the whole of Bengal was supplied by salt from England. Unless, therefore, other items of the ordinary expenditure increased, we should have an excess of the estimate for loss by exchange amounting to £450,000, against a surplus of £144,000. The actual revenue of the last two years had been in each case nearly £1,500,000 over the estimate. We might rely, he thought, upon an increase of revenue of £300,000, which would cover the increased loss from exchange. It must be remembered, too, that a considerable portion of the loss was nominal, the rupee, which for convenience sake was taken at 2*s*., never having touched that figure since. Taking 1*s*. 10*d*. as a fairer rate, and striking off £1,000,000 of our loss as a matter of account, we had an actual loss upon the revenues of India caused by the fall in silver of about £1,800,000. If we could meet this sudden strain without special provision, and yet incur no deficit, it could not be contended that Indian revenues were in an unsatisfactory state.

Having thus described the action of the Indian Government, both in past years as well as in the present, he might not unreasonably be asked if we had any remedies to apply to the evil. If he replied that at present they did not propose any heroic remedies, the House would understand that they adopted this course, not because they did not sympathize with those who were suffering, or that they did not appreciate the gravity of the position or the vastness of the interests affected, but because every proposal had seemed to them, after careful examination, inclined rather to aggravate than to mitigate the evil. He would enumerate the chief suggestions. To stop coining rupees in India was one suggestion. Such an order would, by stopping one of the outlets, lower the price of silver in London, the chief market; and if it raised fictitiously the exchange value of the rupee, which he doubted, it would check the growth of the export trade, which, if left alone at this moment, must draw silver to India, and thus raise the price in London and elsewhere. A policy of raising loans in London had been advocated. Under certain circumstances it might be, as it was this year, justifiable to raise money here; but to broadly adopt a policy of borrowing in England would be madness.

The great object of the Indian Government ought to be the restriction of their expenditure in England; but every pound raised in England drew in subsequent years two pounds from India. Let him take last year's transactions as an illustration. They wanted £2,500,000, which they raised in India. If they had borrowed this in England they should have reduced their drawing upon India for that year from £15,000,000 to £12,500,000. Assuming the loan to be raised at 4 per cent, and for 25 years, during the next 25 years the interest of £100,000 payable annually here was exactly £2,500,000; but then the principal was due—namely, £2,500,000. So that for a saving of £2,500,000 in one year they eventually would have to remit from India to England double that amount in subsequent years.

Another advice suggested the conversion of the payment of their land revenue from silver to gold. If prices rose in India they would lose largely on their land revenue; but he did not despair of arriving at some arrangement equitable alike to the cultivator and owner, as well as to the Government, by which they might prevent much loss; but to request the payment in gold of a revenue hitherto paid in silver, without giving the payer the means of getting the gold, seemed to him a most unjust proceeding. Besides, if they made their debtors pay them in gold, how could they refuse the same method of payment to their creditors, the holders of their Debt, and their civil and military services? This proposal, if carried, in effect, would be both impolitic in its operations and futile in its results, and might therefore be summarily dismissed.

Considerable pressure had been brought upon them to adopt a gold standard in India. He would speak with diffidence upon this proposal, but he certainly thought that some who advocated this change were not aware of the vastness of the transaction, or of the terrible consequences of one false move in a most difficult enterprize. In the first place, if any attempt were made in this direction, he doubted if they could ever retrace their steps, for the change of the standard of value in India involved such a demonetization of silver that that metal would be for ever discarded as a standard of value in Europe. Silver was depreciated now, but what would be the price of silver in London on the morning after it was known that the Indian Government intended to adopt a gold standard? If they entered into such an enterprize they would have crossed the Rubicon and burnt their boats behind them. Could they adopt a gold standard without having gold? It would be ridiculous for India to say to the world, "The value of my silver is much depreciated. I must therefore request you to take it as gold."

There were, however, certain gentlemen, of whom Colonel Smith was a public exponent, who believed that a gold standard might be adopted in India without buying the gold, and the lever by which they proposed to attain this result was the supposed balance of trade in favour of India. Their argument was as follows:—According to the last returns there was a balance of trade during the last eight years of £17,000,000 sterling in favour of India. By adopting a gold standard they would make this balance payable, not as it was now, in silver, but in gold, and in this way they would obtain the necessary gold. Let him for a moment consider this proposition. If there was a balance of £17,000,000 sterling in favour of India, in the first place the balance was in rupees converted at 2*s.* the rupee. In the Report of the Committee special attention was called to this rate of conversion. In the second place, against the balance of trade they had the India Office drafts upon India, amounting to £15,000,000 sterling in gold, to which must be added all private remittances from India, amounting to several millions. He had, therefore, grave doubts as to the large reputed balance in favour of India after taking into account all these transactions. But if there were a balance of trade in favour of India it was due to the expansion of her export trade, and as the rise of prices in India had not corresponded to the fall of silver in London and elsewhere, the export trade was now greatly stimulated. The sole object in adopting a gold standard in India, without a gold currency, was to give the silver rupee a fictitious exchangeable value outside India, and if this was possible (which he doubted) the result would be to at once check and curtail the export trade of India. But this scheme being based entirely upon the excess of exports over imports, the first result of its adoption would be to check natural causes now operating in our favour, and so to destroy the foundation upon which the success of the scheme was based. But there was another objection. Was the bullion imported into India used entirely for coinage or currency purposes? It was well known that it was not. During 20 years £86,000,000 of gold was retained by India; yet gold was only coined in that country in infinitesimal quantities. This immense mass of bullion was either hoarded or converted into ornaments. What applied to gold was equally true of silver, and no change in the currency would affect the import of precious metals for conversion into ornaments. If, therefore, the adaption of a gold standard was scarcely practicable without gold, how were they to get the gold? How much would they want? The amount of silver in circulation in India was considerably over £100,000,000. How would they pay for the gold necessary to represent this sum? Could they keep it in the country if they got it? Above all, what would they fix as the relative price of silver to gold? Over and above all these considerations there was a complication peculiar to India. They could not alter the standard in a day—it was a process requiring years of time. Meanwhile, how would they pay the Home charges? It was a gold liability, and India had only silver assets to meet it. Yet, by the action of the Indian Government itself the relative value of the two metals was changed—the value of gold being enhanced and silver depreciated, or, in other words, during the whole period of the process the annual liabilities of the Indian Government by their own action were being increased at the same time that their assets were being diminished.

He hoped that it was understood that in raising these objections he in no way pronounced that a gold standard in India was impossible. He was merely pointing out some of the many difficulties which they should encounter, and the great necessity for caution. Any mistake in a transaction so gigantic would produce a catastrophe which would bring Indian trade into permanent and perhaps irremediable difficulty. No Government —least of all, the Government of a great and mercantile country—could embark in such an enterprise until they could confidently overcome their primary objections; and any Government who to win a temporary applause by the adoption of an heroic policy incurred such risks would be entitled to eternal censure. He did not attempt in any way to predict the future of silver. He would leave that to others; for so much depended upon the course of trade and the legislative action of nations that prophecy would be dangerous. Two things, however, should be borne in mind. The recent fall in silver was due not to increased production, but to the diminished use made of it in Europe. On the other hand, silver was the standard of value in the East and in countries such as China, where the demand for a metallic currency was practically unlimited, and was only controlled by the expansion or depression of trade.

He had endeavoured to place fairly before the House the present condition of our finances, and he would recapitulate in a few sentences what, he was afraid at tedious length, he had already said. The Revenue had for the past 10 years steadily—and for the last two years rapidly—increased. The ordinary expenditure, excluding the loss by exchange, had not been so progressive, and by a rigid economy they hoped to arrest its further progress. The public works extraordinary were now conducted under more favourable conditions and more rigid scrutiny, and the impetus given to Indian trade by their advancement would not be trammelled by increased payments here. Under the unprecedented loss caused this year by the fall in silver, he did not contemplate a deficit unless the opium advances were much in excess of the estimate; but any excess in opium advances this year meant an increased opium revenue next year.

He did not disguise from the House that it was a great mortification to the Government that at the very time when the expansion of the Indian Revenue afforded opportunities for placing the fiscal system of India upon a sounder basis they were checked by influences which they could not control and for which they could not be held responsible. If upon this all-important subject he was not able to adopt any of the remedies suggested, he could at least promise that it should continue to absorb the attention of the Government, that their communications with India would be constant, and that if the opportunity occurred of making any beneficial proposal at home or abroad, they would not shrink from their responsibilities or hesitate to use their powers; for they felt sure that in this, as well as in every similar discussion, they might rely upon the advice and aid of Parliament in assisting them to unravel a complicated problem, upon a correct solution of which would mainly depend the future trade, finance, and prosperity of a vast and integral part of the Empire.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. FAWCETT, who rose to move the following Resolution:—

> "This House views with apprehension the constant additions which are made to the Debt of India, and is of opinion that, considering the serious loss that has been caused, and may continue to be caused to India, by the depreciation in the value of silver, no new public works should be undertaken which would necessitate the raising of fresh loans; and that in order to place the finances of India on a more satisfactory basis, the distinction which is now made between ordinary and extraordinary expenditure should be discontinued,"

said, in the first place that Indian finances were in a position of greater gravity than they had ever before occupied; and, secondly, that nothing was more unfortunate than to raise great expectations and then to shatter them. He had been much struck by the remarkable contrast between the beginning and the end of the noble Lord's speech. The first part of his speech reminded him of the time when the Under Secretary in the late Government presented everything in roseate hues—a growing revenue, a satisfactory state of the expenditure, remunerative public works, everything going on prosperously; but after parading all this the noble Lord changed his tone, and told them that a crisis of unequalled gravity had come upon India, and to make both ends meet the Government had been obliged to borrow £4,000,000. The surpluses which were relied upon with so much confidence were purely fictitious. They only existed through the vicious way in which the Indian accounts were kept. The real way of stating the financial position of India was that her Debt was increasing at the rate of £3,000,000 a-year, and the interest of that Debt was increasing at the rate of £130,000 a-year. During the last three years the aggregate deficit was not less than £10,500,000. That would continue so long as they kept up the delusion of ordinary and extraordinary expenditure. Sir William Muir, in his Budget statement last March, said the depreciation of silver was casting a grave shadow over the future, and this was the most serious danger that ever threatened the finance of India. The question of the depreciation of silver as it affected the financial position of India might be regarded first as a decline in the value of silver compared with gold, and next as a decline in the purchasing power of silver in India. Next, he might consider the causes which had brought about this depreciation, and whether it was likely to continue to diminish or to increase. Thirdly, he would consider some of the remedies which had been proposed for correcting the mischief which the depreciation of silver was producing; and, fourthly, if no reliance could be placed on any of these, then came the practical question—what was the financial policy which the Government ought to adopt? It was not necessary to enlarge on the first point after what the Under Secretary had said as to the effect which the depreciation of silver exercised on Indian finance. There were three modes of meeting a deficit—borrowing, additional taxation, and increased retrenchment. Government had adopted the first of these, which was simply a desperate expedient. The deficit next year would not be less, but greater, because the interest on the loan would have to be provided for, so that the deficit would accumulate on the principle of compound interest. The term "depreciation of silver" was employed in two different senses—a depreciation as compared with the value of gold and with its purchasing power in India. He agreed that the depreciation of silver had been simply a gold depreciation; it had not been accompanied to a marked extent by a decline in purchasing power or a rise in general prices in India. The practical question was, could this state of things continue? If it could not, what would be the position of the Indian Government when there was a falling off in purchasing power and a rise in prices? As things were, it became profitable to purchase silver and send it to India; and the effect of that would be an increase in the Indian export trade, and a decline in its import trade; indeed, those effects were already beginning to manifest themselves, and the consequence would be, as Sir William Muir estimated, it would require £3,000,000 more to adjust the balance of trade. The increased cost of materials and the advance of wages would increase the cost of administration. A considerable portion of the Revenue was a fixed amount of silver; there was heavy loss on the £15,000,000 of Home Charges; and the loss to residents in India in sending remittances home for their families would be equivalent to an income tax of 20 per cent on the amount remitted. There would therefore be disturbance in trade and dislocation of commercial relations. The depreciation of silver was not the result of panic; and the chief difficulty was to explain how it was that the fall had not been much greater, seeing that the supply had been doubled in four years, and that the increased supply had been accompanied by a falling demand. He bore testimony to the ability and fairness with which his right hon. Friend (Mr. Goschen) had presided over the Committee, and he argued that the value of silver was determined by the same laws as the value of wheat or coal, or any other commodity. He agreed that nothing could be more hazardous than to make predictions about the future value of silver. The causes of the depreciation were the discovery of mines of extraordinary richness in America, which had increased the yield from £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 to £14,000,000 or £15,000,000 a-year, simultaneously with the demonetization of silver in Germany and Holland, and a restricted use of it in other countries. The most potent cause of the depreciation was that for 11 years before 1871, India, on an average, absorbed £16,000,000 sterling of silver every year; whereas during the last four years the average absorption had been little more than £3,500,000 worth. For some years the absorption by India was equivalent to twice as much silver as all the silver mines annually produced, and now it was only half the yield from one source of supply, the silver mines of the United States. There were many circumstances which might favourably affect the value of silver, while, on the other hand, it must be borne in mind that some persons affirmed that the silver mines of America were only in the infancy of their development. It would also be unwise to conclude that France would go on purchasing silver to the same extent as during the last three years. Without hazarding a prediction as to the future, the Indian Government would be rash in concluding that this fall in silver was the result of a panic. Coming next to the remedies that might be proposed, he would remark that no part of the noble Lord's speech had given him more satisfaction than the assurance that the Indian Government were going to be firm against the propounders of currency nostrums. Nothing could be clearer than the unadvisability of introducing a gold currency into India. That country must be too poor for a gold currency, of which it had been said by an Indian official before the Indian Finance Committee, that thousands of the people of Bengal had never had even the smallest silver coin in their possession. An opinion was held in certain high quarters that, although it would be unwise to introduce a gold currency into India, you might have a gold standard. This, however, would be a breach of faith, and would be objectionable on several grounds. Another recommendation was that the price of silver should be kept up by restricting the coinage of rupees. This would, however, bring about a real panic in silver. It might be asked what ought to be the financial policy of the Indian Government with a view to meet the loss which had been measured at £2,500,000 a-year. It could only be met in one of three ways—by loan, by additional taxation, or by rigid retrenchment. With respect to borrowing, that was only postponing the evil day, for the loan must be paid off, and meanwhile the interest would be an additional burden on the taxpayers. Additional taxation could only be effected by having recourse to that which had been well called, "the financial reserve of India"—namely, the income tax. The income tax in India had for political reasons been abandoned as unsuited to the country, and even if it could be resorted to, while a trifle over 1*d*. in the pound would be sufficient to meet a deficit of £2,500,000 in England, in India it would require 1*s*. in the pound to do so. The only remedy was to be found in rigid retrenchment; and how was economy to be effected? The noble Lord had spoken of the finances of India as being in a thriving condition. He regretted he could not so regard them, the annual increase in revenue from all sources amounting to £100,000 only. In fact, the financial position of India might thus be described—a very slowly-increasing revenue, a steadily-increasing expenditure, a rapidly increasing Debt — which had doubled itself in 18 years—and every year a large deficit arising from the expenditure on what were called reproductive works, but which, he ventured to assert, did not pay the interest of the money expended upon them. It seemed to him that the first necessity of the situation was to get rid of that distinction, which did nothing but confuse—the system of dividing the expenditure into ordinary and extraordinary. Many of the reproductive works were not likely to return interest upon the expenditure. The accounts of their future works were in such a condition that they might hand them over to the most experienced man and he would be puzzled to say whether or not there was a reproductive return. As to the reproductiveness of many of these works he might observe that on the State railways the net return was £118,000, though the expenditure on them was £14,500,000. Many of them had been constructed for stategical purposes, were military roads in fact, and could not possibly be of advantage to the trading community, and scarcely returned any interest upon money which had been borrowed for their construction at 4 per cent. Again, of all the irrigation works we had undertaken, he defied the noble Lord to put his finger on one which he could say had proved a financial success. The country had been told that the Orissa Irrigation Works would yield a return of 16 per cent. Government accordingly bought them, paying for them £1,500,000. The revenue last year amounted to only £4,000, and yet the working expenses amounted to £22,000, or a loss of £18,000. The Madras Works were equally profitless. The old Water Works at the Jumna, however, built by Akbar, were paying 35 per cent, and the revenue from them was thrown into the General Irrigation hodge-podge, and thus mitigated the loss. Did the Under Secretary for India forget what Lord Salisbury said on the subject last year, when he asserted that with regard to irrigation works there was not among those constructed by the English one instance of a genuine financial success? Was it possible for them to come to any other conclusion than that, however desirable railways and canals in India might be, no certainty could be arrived at that they would meet the expenses involved. One of the first things which ought to be done in the way of retrenchment to meet the loss consequent on the depreciation of silver, was that they should decide that for the present no new public works should be constructed which would involve the raising of fresh loans. It was a radical defect in the financial arrangements of India that, instead of going into the open market when it was necessary to procure the services of engineers, a costly Government educational establishment was kept up at Cooper's Hill, and a number of engineers, for whom it was necessary in some way to provide, were from time to time sent out to India. If the Army expenditure went on increasing at the present rate, the Government, although they were the proprietors of almost all the land of India, would soon be obliged to expend almost all the land revenue upon Army charges. Again, the present administration of Bombay was a marvel of extravagance. Vast sums of money were recklessly spent. There was no reason why the cost of administration at Bombay or Madras should be greater than in the North-West Provinces. The time had come for getting rid of the sort of semi-State which was observed at Bombay and Madras. More resort should be had to Native agency, which was less expensive than European agency. Natives had shown that they possessed political capacity, as was shown in the case of Sir Salar Jung. It was a sorrowful reflection connected with our rule in India that somehow we seemed to have crushed out Native capacity, especially in utilizing the resources of nature. A young English engineer might understand engineering theoretically and might be well acquainted with mathematics, but what was wanted in India was acquaintance with local peculiarities and necessities. Between the Chenab and the Sutlej, where rain hardly ever fell, by means of irrigation works constructed by Natives this district was once turned into a paradise of plenty. Now if the Natives had shown such capacity in the past, why should not their services be utilized in these days? This was a question of great political as well as financial importance. In making these remarks he fully appreciated the difficulty of the question with which the noble Lord had had to deal. Despite present unfavourable appearances he looked forward with no little hope to the future. He believed that India would in the future obtain abundant recompense for the loss brought upon her by the depreciation of silver, if it should enforce on those responsible for her government the lessons of economy which had hitherto been too much neglected. There was nothing in the administration of Lord Salisbury he so much regretted as the speech he delivered on the repeal of the Indian import duties. However great the theoretical arguments against those duties, there were others, such as the salt duty and the stamp duty, which pressed more severely on India, and he could not help thinking that a pledge somewhat carelessly given to repeal the import duties was likely under the circumstances to produce discontent. He thanked the House for the patient hearing they had given to the remarks he had made. In making them he had no other object in view but to do what little he could to strengthen the hands of the Government in contending with the difficulties they had now to encounter in the financial administration of India. If they had the courage to face those difficulties, carrying out the most rigid economy, they on that side of the House would not be so unpatriotic as to turn those difficulties to any Party advantage, but would do all in their power cordially and loyally to restore stability and equilibrium to the finances of India, and bring greater contentment to the people of that great country. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving his Resolution.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House views with apprehension the constant additions which are made to the debt of India, and is of opinion that, considering the serious loss that has been caused, and may continue to be caused to India, by the depreciation in the value of silver, no new public works should be undertaken which would necessitate the raising of fresh loans; and that, in order to place the finances of India on a more satisfactory basis, the distinction which is now made between ordinary and extraordinary expenditure should be discontinued,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. SIDEBOTTOM: Sir, I do not often trouble the House with any observations, but as an extensive English cotton manufacturer, and as having the honour to represent a large and important manufacturing constituency, I have placed a Notice on the Paper relative to the import duties levied in India upon cotton goods, in the hope that—though I am aware it cannot be moved as a formal Amendment—it may have the effect of raising some discussion on this important subject, as I think it is most desirable that, before we separate for the Recess, it should be made clearly known that the present system of Protection prevailing in India, as exemplified by these duties, is condemned alike by this House and by enlightened public opinion throughout the country, for it appears to me difficult to determine whether that system of Protection ought to be more condemned in the interest of this country or of India itself. Now, the amount of this duty is 5 per cent, and we contend that it raises the price of cotton goods throughout India, that it seriously handicaps English manufacturers, and greatly hinders our trade with that country, and that it fosters and encourages the rise of mills in India to an undue extent. Some hon. Members may perhaps consider that 5 per cent is not after all such a very heavy duty, and that it cannot really make so much difference whether it is repealed or not; but we must remember that the disadvantage to the English manufacturer is not 5 per cent on his profits—if profits he is ever to know again—but 5 per cent on his whole turnover, and if English manufacturers could be insured 5 per cent profit on their turnover by consenting to give up the chance of anything more I, for one, would gladly accede to any such arrangement, and I think most other English manufacturers would willingly do the same. Well, after the very able despatches of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India, which have been laid on the Table of this House, and which I hold in my hand, I feel that little can indeed be added to the masterly arguments he has brought forward and the very strong case he has presented in favour of the repeal of these duties; and it would be an easy task to maintain the propositions I have enunciated by reading from these despatches and the statistics adduced. They have, however, now for some time been in the hands of hon. Members, and have, I hope, already been carefully and attentively read by all who take an interest in this subject and it is therefore unnecessary to recapitulate at length what the House is already probably sufficiently familiar with. It has been said that we do not hold India for the benefit of English cotton manufacturers, and that therefore we ought to approach the consideration of this subject from an Indian point of view exclusively. Well, granting that for a moment for the sake of argument, these duties appear to me utterly indefensible even on that ground. They undoubtedly raise the price of their principal article of clothing to the Native population of India, and are, in short, taxing the many for the benefit of the few. It has also been said that the people of India wish these duties to be retained. But what proof have we of this? Who are the people of India? Do they consist, I should like to know, merely of the eight Government officials who voted at Simla in favour of the present Tariff Bill. If it had been possible to consult the great body of the Indian consumers, would the Tariff Bill have been passed with their consent? I venture to think that the consumers of India are quite sufficiently acute and quite sufficiently alive to their own interests as to have given no consent to the passing of that measure, or of thus perpetuating a tax upon their chief article of clothing, and yet the consumers of India have surely as much right to be considered the people of India as the official gentlemen who voted at Simla or the millowners of Bombay. As has been stated by the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, and quoted by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) in his eloquent despatch—

> "This duty is maintained at the expense of the consumers principally, the poorer class, against whom it tells with particular hardship in a prime necessary, such as clothing,"

and although presiding as they do over the destinies of that great Empire, it is doubtless the duty of the British Government to promote, by every legitimate means, the material interests of India. It cannot surely be their duty to permit the many to be taxed for the benefit of the few, or to aid a few British and other capitalists in amassing enormous fortunes by developing the cotton manufactures of India to the exclusion and injury of those of England herself. But I go further than this, and maintain that in considering the question of retaining or repealing those duties, their effect upon the manufacturing trade of this country ought also to be taken into account. They are directly contrary to the principles of Free Trade, and have a most powerful tendency to foster the rise of cotton mills—both spinning and manufacturing—in India to the great detriment and loss of English manufacturers and the serious injury of English workpeople and operatives, and this is indeed a most important consideration. The great cotton industry has from £125,000,000 to £130,000,000 of capital invested in it, it affords direct employment to about 500,000 operatives, and it is estimated by the last Census that there are altogether no fewer than 2,000,000 of people dependent upon it; and these operatives are far more immediately and far more seriously interested in the repeal of these duties than even the employers, because, although a large amount of capital is leaving England for the purpose of establishing mills in India the workpeople cannot follow the capital. Their labour is their only capital, and in the prospect of a stoppage of mills in England they see nothing but ruin, distress, and misery before them. Nor will the House, I think, be of opinion that these apprehensions are destitute of foundation when it is remembered that in the year 1859, before the high duty was imposed, there were only three cotton mills in Bombay, whilst there are now upwards of 40; that in the year 1870 the value of English machinery imported into India was £304,000, but last year the value was £1,545,000. And English machinery being allowed to enter India thus freely without duty, it certainly seems but scant justice for our competitors in that country, after availing themselves to the utmost of the advantages thus afforded, to repay us by placing a heavy protective duty on our goods; and if the exigencies of the Indian Exchequer really do imperatively demand that a tax should be imposed on some article of British production, it appears to me far more reasonable, far more just, and far more in accordance with the dictates of common sense that such a tax should be placed upon English machinery rather than upon English cotton goods. But I confess that I utterly fail to see by what process of reasoning or logic ardent supporters of a policy of Free Trade here at home can at the same time advocate one of obsolete Protection in India. As has been well said by a high authority on this subject, Colonel Raynsford Jackson—

> "So far as the progress of cotton manufactures of India is aided by the natural advantages of that country, by cheap cotton, cheap labour, and markets close at hand, we are quite prepared to lose that portion of our trade, but we do object to having it torn from us by the aid of our own Government and by protective duties."

These are wise words, well worthy the attentive consideration of the House. We English manufacturers ask for nothing but a fair field and no favour, and surely we are already sufficiently handicapped. Consider the enormous distances our goods have to traverse to reach the markets of India. We have to bring the raw cotton (I am, of course, now speaking of Indian or Surat cotton) all the way from India to England, manufacture it here in England, then convey it back again to India, paying all the charges, and enormous cost of transit both ways, wages here in England are eight or ten times as much as they are in India, and what is a most important element in the cost, of far more importance probably than hon. Gentlemen not conversant with the trade can readily comprehend—there is practically no restriction on the hours of labour there. Accordingly we find that we have already lost our trade with India in the coarser goods, which can be sold cheaper by native manufacturers and under the fostering, but in the long run baneful and deleterious, influence of these protective tariffs; in the fine goods also the Indian mills are now fast threatening to deprive us of our trade with that country. It appears to me most monstrous and unjust that in addition to the natural disadvantages with which we have to contend, we should have Indian mills assisted, and English mills injured by a heavy protective duty being placed upon English goods before they are allowed to enter the country. Some sense, indeed, of this injustice, appears to have made itself manifest to the Government of India, and to have caused them to place a duty of 5 per cent upon cotton not the produce of India, but a more illusory system of compensation could not be conceived. It could under no circumstances amount to more than about half the same duty placed upon goods which are of course much more valuable than the raw cotton out of which they are made, the whole cost of their manufacture being included, but the arguments by which it is supported are based altogether on false premises—upon the assumption that the medium and finer class of goods cannot be made wholly or in part out of Indian cotton, whilst as was truly stated by the deputation to the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) and quoted by his Lordship in his despatches—

> "The whole of the medium goods which comprise the trade in shirtings can be made of Indian raw cotton, with or without the admixture of the imported material," and "there is nothing to prevent the gradual substitution of Indian for British manufactures in a trade which constitutes nearly two-thirds of the total exports from England to India."

It is indeed a most significant fact that whilst, owing to the general prosperity of the country, to the great increase of wages, to the enormous development of railways, and other causes, the value of goods imported into Calcutta, where they are not so much exposed to the competition of the native mills, has in 14 years increased 77 per cent, the corresponding advance in Bombay has been only 12 per cent; whilst in the coarser goods, comparing the years 1872, 1873, and 1874 with the three years before the American War there has actually been a decrease of more than half the figures, being in the proportion to 15 to 7. These facts, I think, speak volumes; but we have been told by those whose high position and exalted rank lends an importance to their statements, which they would not otherwise command, that the request for the repeal of these duties is all a "Manchester delusion." Well, many charges have been made against Manchester men and the class to which I belong, but of all the charges—open or covert, expressed direct, or implied—which have ever been made, this is what I should have least expected. Hitherto we have, generally, at least, been credited with a tolerably clear perception of our own interests, and if those who made this charge had seen the large and most influential deputation of employers and employed combined, representing nearly the whole cotton industry of Lancashire and the neighbouring counties, which waited on the Secretary of State for India in reference to this subject a short time ago, and witnessed the earnest, resolute, and the unanimous feeling which animated the members of that deputation, I think they would not have come to the conclusion that it was only "a Manchester delusion." But this is by no means the only charge which has been made against us. It has been said that we do not approach this question with clean hands, and in some cases even the word "fraudulent" has been made use of in reference to the heavy sizing of some description of goods for the Indian markets. Now, although a manufacturer, I am entirely without bias in this matter, because, though my family have been engaged in the cotton trade from its very infancy, for three generations neither my grandfather, my father, nor myself have, so far as I know, made goods for India at any time, being engaged in an entirely different branch of the trade. Now the practice of making these heavily-sized goods originated, I believe, during the American cotton famine, when manufacturers, driven to their wits' end, were fain to have recourse to well-nigh any expedient to supply the want of raw cotton. This class of goods, therefore, has been before the Indian consumers for 10 or 12 years. The Indian consumers know their exact quality perfectly well, and also that they can at any time have the better article at a relative price. As a matter of fact, however, they do, I believe, in many instances prefer the heavily-sized goods at the cheaper price. Now it is a well-known axiom in trade, that "demand always begets supply," and now that the necessity of their manufacture has long since passed away, the demand for them is really the reason why they are still produced, so that it is simply puerile and absurd to attach any blame to English manufacturers on this score. I apprehend it must be admitted that it is the inherent and inalienable right of all Her Majesty's subjects to trade on equal terms throughout the whole of the dominions subject to the authority of the British Parliament, and that, therefore, these duties ought to be abolished at the earliest possible period, but it is urged that the exigencies of the Indian Exchequer are such that they cannot be repealed just as present. Well, I am not prepared to deny the cogency and the force of this argument. No doubt the Government of India is at the present moment labouring under exceptional difficulties owing to the great depreciation which has taken place in the value of silver, as, of course, this raises the cost of all payments which have to be made to England in gold, but it must not be forgotten that great as may be the loss to the Government of India the loss to British manufacturers and British merchants is also great; transactions which seemed to afford a fair chance of a profitable return, but too often resulting in ruinous loss in consequence, so that this decline in the value of silver really at present constitutes another and most serious tax upon British goods. It certainly seems very hard that in consequence of this another tax should also be retained, but I speak with the very greatest diffidence on this question. It is a most complex and difficult subject, and the more it is considered the more difficult it appears. So far, however, as the trade in cotton goods is concerned, it is not perhaps likely to continue eventually to have the same disastrous effects as at present, because their price will be governed by the law of supply and demand, and will in the long run probably be adjusted and accommodated to the value of the currency in which payment is made. Well, many methods have been suggested for overcoming or at least mitigating this evil. One is by adopting a gold standard, and much can be said both for and against this plan. The Government of India have also themselves pointed out that their loss would be partly met if by borrowing money in England their remittances were reduced, and it is possible also that if a portion of the paper currency was gradually withdrawn and silver substituted, the demand for silver would be increased. It seems, however, very doubtful whether it is not wiser to leave such difficulties to be overcome by the operation of natural laws. But, however this may be, the Indian Revenue is shown to be still very expansive. It amounts at the present moment to about £50,000,000 sterling; and when we remember that in the year 1840 it was only about £20,000,000, and that in the year 1855, since which year there has been no accession of territory, its amount was only between £30,000,000 and £40,000,000, and that the amount raised by the import duties upon cotton goods is barely £800,000, I think the House will be of opinion that such alterations and retrenchments might at no very distant date be effected as would enable these duties to be eventually repealed. In the presence of the noble Lord who represents the India Office in this House (Lord George Hamilton), it would ill become me to suggest by what means or from what sources the Revenue ought to be raised. I do not wish to enter into the question as to whether the vast expenditure which has for a long time past been taking place has or has not been upon profitable undertakings, whether the rich Natives are or are not a very lightly-taxed class, or whether the income tax is or is not a suitable tax for India. Neither do I venture to suggest whether there ought to be a retrenchment of expenditure, or a change in the incidence of taxation; but I do venture most respectfully and most earnestly to urge upon the noble Lord and upon the House, and upon the country, that under no circumstances whatever ought any portion of the Revenue of India to be raised for one moment longer than can possibly be avoided by levying a tax upon British goods; that it is contrary to public policy and the best interests of the Empire so to raise it; and that, in fact, any method would be preferable to this. Besides, if England is bound to balance the Indian Budget, and make good any deficiency in the Revenue, surely the burden ought to be borne by the whole country, not by Lancashire alone, and it has, indeed, been often said that it would be less objectionable for Lancashire to pay the amount in hard cash than in the present most obnoxious form. We must remember, also, that these duties, if not repealed, may soon have an effect far wider, far more mischievous, and far more injurious, than even raising the price of clothing throughout India. They must affect most prejudicially the prospects of any overland trade with those countries of Central Asia which are not yet subject to the sway of Russia, where prohibitory tariffs are consequently not yet introduced, and the price of goods, therefore, is a serious element in the trade. But important as the question becomes from this point of view, important as it may be alike to the Indian consumer and the English manufacturer, I venture to think that there are far wider, broader, and far more important considerations still. It is eminently an Imperial question. Much of the prosperity, much of the wealth, and much of the greatness of this country, depends upon our unrivalled pre-eminence in commerce and in manufactures, and it will indeed be an evil day for England which witnesses any decline in either the one or the other. Well, one-third of the entire exports of the country consist of cotton goods, and one-fifth of those cotton goods goes to India, and if deprived of the Indian markets how can we replace them? Cotton manufacturing has of late years made such rapid strides on the Continent of Europe, that it seems probable less of our goods will soon be required there even than now. As an illustration of this I may, perhaps, be allowed to mention that the whole production of a large cotton concern then belonging to a branch of my family used to go almost exclusively to Russia, but by prohibitory duties Russia now endeavours to exclude all English goods and yarns, and there seems, indeed, to be a steady decline in our exports of cotton goods to all other countries except India; for in the year 1872 our exports to all countries except India amounted in the aggregate to £66,000,000, but last year only to about £55,000,000. Nor is this falling off wholly to be ascribed, though, no doubt, it is to some extent owing to the depreciation in value. So this is really a most serious question, which more or less concerns every individual and every class in this country. The great depression at present unhappily existing in well nigh every branch of industry and trade all over the country, affords, indeed, but too conspicuous an illustration of the evils which would be in store for the whole country if we were to suffer any permanent paralysis of our own trade. Great as would be our misfortunes, they would by no means fall upon our own heads alone, but would tell with disastrous and crushing effect upon well nigh every class and upon well nigh every interest in this Kingdom. The present position of the great cotton industry is not indeed at the present moment so bright that it can very well afford the imposition of unnecessary or artificial restrictions. Seldom has it been more gloomy. On all sides we hear of accumulation of stocks and absence of demand, and if, as seems but too probable, the prospect should become darker and more dark, till it finally culminates in scarcity of employment, distress, and its inevitable accompaniment, increased pauperism and increased rates, I hope hon. Gentlemen who are opposed to the repeal of these duties will, at all events, do us the justice to remember the one prominent case of the depression in an industry upon which 2,000,000 of people depend for their daily bread has been pointed out during this discussion, and that in asking for the repeal of these duties we are asking for a fair field and no favour—not in the interests of Lancashire alone, but of the whole country, and of India itself.

MR. BRIGGS: I hope, Sir, that the House will pardon me if I venture to address them for a few moments this evening. I claim the indulgence of hon. Members for two reasons—first, because I have not occupied much of their attention and their time this Session; and then, because those who have sent me here to Parliament hold the question which has now at length been brought before the notice of hon. Members to be to them of the greatest interest and importance. Indeed, Sir, did I wish to give an instance of the unjust incidence of this tax of 5 per cent, and to show what an onus it is upon our industry—what a restriction upon our enterprize—I could not do better than take as an example the district with which I am most familiar, and tell you that, within a circle of two miles from the centre of Blackburn, there are some 52,000 looms at work. Of these, 46,000 are engaged in the production of cloth for the Indian market; and the House will, I think, be startled when I tell them that last year no less a sum than £248,000 was paid by this small area to the Indian Exchequer. Sir, we have always protested against these duties. I admit at the outset that they were originally imposed for purposes of the Revenue only; but, at that time even, my hon. Friend the Member for Manchester (Sir Thomas Bazley), warned the House that these duties would in the end become protective in their nature. Sir, they have become protective, and from the moment they developed this protective element, our objections and our protestations assumed a more active and more offensive form; and so during the late Recess, and, indeed, for some time before, an agitation was carried on against these duties, and meetings were held in order to find out a means of securing their abolition—an agitation not carried on by those who have been termed the selfish employers of labour, but by the employed—meetings called together not by greedy capitalists, but by those whose only capital was the labour they had to sell, and who, as the noble Lord opposite (Lord George Hamilton) was reminded by a deputation that waited upon him at the India Office, cannot follow that ever-increasing stream of gold which is being poured into that great Indian Dependency of ours for the purpose of nourishing a competing industry whose giant and exotic growth is springing up under the shadow of these protective duties. Sir, I attended several of those meetings, at the invitation of working men; and I wish that hon. Members of this House could have been there too, for, as they gazed upon the sea of serious upturned faces, and marked the eagerness, the closeness, the attention, with which they followed the observations, the arguments, the statistics of those who addressed them, hon. Members could not have failed to be convinced, a. I myself was convinced, of the deep, I might almost say, painful interest which in Lancashire is taken in the question now before the House. No, Sir, painful is not too strong a word; for, looking at the gloomy prospects of the trade, and with the horrors of the Cotton Famine still fresh in his memory, can it be wondered at if your Lancashire operative indulges in a feeling of that kind? But I am sorry to add that some bitterness is beginning to be mingled with his thoughts when he reflects that these duties cannot, and never have been maintained, on the high grounds of fairness and justice, but that those who seek to retain them, whether from disinterested motives, like those of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), or from interested motives, like those of that small band of monopolists in India—who alone, I will venture to say, benefit by their retention—always base their claim to a non-abolition of these duties on the assertion that the machinery of Indian finance is of such a fragile and intricate character, that the balance of the Indian Budget is so delicately adjusted, that the loss of this £800,000 a-year, which it would be necessary to forego, would plunge the finances of India, and the financial proposals of the Government, into inextricable, unutterable, and chaotic confusion. Sir, I think that those who hold these views do the able financiers of India a wrong, for what do we see this very year? The Government of India is suddenly called upon to fill up a large gap in their finances. By the depreciation of silver they are subjected to a heavy loss; and here I might remark, *si licet parva componere magnis*, that Lancashire manufacturers suffer more in proportion than the Government does from the depreciation of silver. Well, how do they propose to meet the loss? Do they propose to place further taxation on the people of India? No, Sir, they propose to meet the loss by reducing their ordinary expenditure. This item "extraordinary expenditure," is a terrible weapon in the hands of an Indian Finance Minister; for, supposing that for any reason he dreads having a surplus, it is easy for him to propose to dig a canal, or carry out some public work of that kind. Sir, I find that, between the years 1867 and 1874, over £13,000,000 have been spent in this way; and it was proposed, originally, to spend about £4,000,000 this year—all this money charged to revenue and not to capital. The income of India in 1840 was £20,000,000, and that was sufficient to meet the expenditure, and yet £50,000,000 in 1875 is barely sufficient to meet the claims on the public purse. It appears to me that Indian financiers are on the horns of a dilemma; either India is a rich country, or India is a poor country. If she is a rich country, she can well afford to do without this £800,000 for which we ask; but, if she be poor, than the system of finance which at present exists is a bad one, and ought never to have been pursued. I will give one instance. We have had two famines; one in Ireland, and the other in India. The Irish famine was paid for by money borrowed and repaid by instalments; the Indian famine was paid for by money taken from current revenue; so that India, which is said to be poor, pursued a line of policy which great, rich England did not attempt to do. And now I leave the lofty regions of finance and come back to my cotton. I do not think it would be right to enter at length into the question of competition as between the Indian manufacturer and ourselves. That has been so admirably dealt with by the hon. Member who preceded me (Mr. Sidebottom), that I will not try the patience of the House by quartering the same ground again, and I will therefore pass by, merely mentioning some of the immunities and privileges which the Indian manufacturer enjoys over his English brother—such as, for instance, an untaxed income; immunity from Factory Acts; propinquity to the raw material out of which he manufactures his goods, and nearness to the market in which he sells them; and, last—this I commend especially to the notice of hon. Members —a happy indifference to the fall of silver, which, indeed, acts as a second protection to Indian manufacturers. And, Sir, I say that, when you are told that this Indian trade can increase some 50 per cent in one year, when you know that English competition in the coarse trade has been driven out of the country, and that the extra amount of capital which now finds its way to India is attacking the medium class of goods, of which two-thirds of our exports to India consist, I think the House will see for themselves that the competition with India is a real and severe competition, and is not of that "bogus" character which I have heard denounced in this House. I would beg hon. Gentlemen to remember one or two things; first, that the so-called Indian millowner is in the majority of cases an Englishman, who finds in that country a more remunerative return for his capital outlay; second, that the presence of these protected mills do not cheapen by one farthing to the poor Hindoo the cotton goods, which to him are one of the necessaries of life; and I can assure noble Lords, in other places, that their presence in the country does not exclude from the cloth manufactured in India that deleterious matter which a noble Lord termed gypsum, for I fear that, with the benefits and civilizing influences of manufacturing industry, the Hindoo imported some of its vices which we all deplore. Thirdly—and on this point I lay stress—that of this duty, if it were abolished, not one penny would go into the pockets of the Lancashire operative or millowner, but would go soon, if not at once, towards increasing the purchasing power of the money of the poor inhabitants of India. But then some hon. Member might say —"But have you, then, no selfish motive at the bottom of all this? Do not you expect to get something by the abolition of these duties?—and I should say—"Certainly I do," but I should not call myself selfish. I should say that I was inspired by a feeling of enlightened self-interest. In other words, Sir, we do not expect an enhanced profit from the goods which we now sell; but we do hope to benefit by an increased basis for our commercial operations, and by a fairer and more even competition, as between the Indian manufacturer and ourselves. And now, Sir, let us look at what has been done in this matter. The noble Lord the Secretary of State for India (the Marquess of Salisbury) seeing that there was an Imperial side as well as a local Indian one to this question, and, judging that no Government was justified in taking up the role of Mrs. Jellyby in Dickens' novel, who was so anxious for the moral and material progress of Borrioboolagha that she was entirely oblivious of the wants and necessities of those of her own family, sent a despatch to India, which, robbed of its official verbiage,

—I do not speak disrepectfully—amounted to this—"These duties are bad in theory, and worse in practice; they ought to be abolished—they must be abolished as soon as you can afford; and I invite you to fix a term of years, the end of which shall be the vanishing point for these duties." But so careful was the noble Marquess to avoid embarrassing the Government in their financial proposals, so studious was he to avoid placing any new burden on the people of India that he expressly declared that he would sanction no new tax for the purpose of getting rid of the cotton duties. Now, when the Government of India received this despatch, what did they do in an out-of-the-way place in India, far removed from that public opinion which, I will venture to say, does exist? In the absence of those unofficial Members of the Council who are, you might say, specially appointed to give opinions in a case of this character, with indecent haste, and on frivolous grounds, they passed a measure which went directly contrary to the expressed wishes and desire of the noble Marquess; and then, with a grim humour which the noble Marquess was, I think, not slow to appreciate, they telegraphed to say what they had done. When the noble Marquess received this telegram, he sent another despatch calling his insubordinate subordinates to order; and here, Sir, my duty as a critic of these Papers ends. I am far too young a Member of this House to venture for a moment to criticize the amenities of official and diplomatic correspondence, but this general remark I think I may make—that, both in the despatches to which I have alluded, and the correspondence which follows, the noble Marquess deals with his opponents and his critics much in the same way as a skilful player does with the nine pins in a familiar game. During the time in which this correspondence was going on, I heard rumours that there was an attempt being made by some noble Lord or right hon. Gentleman to make the Viceroy of India and his Council nothing more than puppets dancing at the end of the telegraph wire worked by the said noble Lord or right hon. Gentleman in Downing Street; and if this could have been anything but a ridiculous proposition it would have received my condemnation; but I can see something worse which might happen, I mean making the Indian Minister here—the Representative of our Imperial sway—nothing more than the mouthpiece of Indian officialism, and degrading the deliberations of his Council to the level of what I have heard the hon. Member for Hackney denounce as a sham—the discussion of the Indian Budget in this House. If we allowed this to happen, Sir, we should be guilty of a policy which John Stuart Mill, in his Minutes, has declared to be the very ideal of badness—the one among all imaginable arrangements of the matter in question which no circumstances could justify, or could render otherwise than preposterous. I am told, Sir, that public opinion does not exist in India on this matter; but I have heard an ex-President of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce declare that, in the interest of the Indian mills themselves, these duties ought to be abolished; and, if you could only get the Native to understand this question, he would naturally say — "You had £400,000 to give away last year, and what did you do with it? Pipes and cigars, harness and saddlery; even billiard tables came in from your country, and you took £10,000 a-year from off the milinery and frippery of your wives, and yet you left this indefensible tax upon the clothing of the millions you profess to govern for their own good." Sir, in conclusion, we Lancashire manufacturers and operatives are fully aware of the grave responsibilities which rest on the shoulders of those of our distinguished countrymen who sway the destinies of our Indian Empire. We know how difficult—aye! how dangerous, under certain circumstances—it may be to impose a new tax upon that congregation of nations, alien in colour and creed, who have been rendered sullen and suspicious by centuries of oppression and wrong, and who are only now beginning to love and appreciate the benefits and blessings of our rule. That we do not ask; but, on the other hand, we do think that a country which has displayed such remarkable elasticity of trade, of which the noble Lord the Under Secretary has this evening borne such conclusive testimony—a country whose military expenditure is enormous — which can afford, apparently, to lose nigh on £2,000,000 of money in its postal, telegraphic, and railway service—which, out of current income, can pay in ready money, the expenses of a great and devastating Famine—can, so we think, if economic counsels prevail, spare to us this miserable £800,000 in the interests of justice and fairness towards 80,000 of our fellow-countrymen, and in deference to those principles of Free Trade which have, I believe, become the leading political axioms of this country, and which throughout the world have contributed in no small degree to our stability and our power.

MR. BALFOUR said, that to form an estimate of the value of silver in the immediate future was out of the question. The value of silver depended upon the demand and the supply. France needed a supply of £1,000,000 a-year in silver for a population of 30,000,000, and if the same mode of computation were applied to Germany, America, and England the total amount required for subsidiary silver coinage would be about £6,000,000. The question would then remain as to how much would be required for the rest of the world, and especially for India. He thought that India would continue to absorb an average quantity of silver of the value of £5,000,000 annually. The position of India towards us was that of a country paying tribute to another. He believed the ultimate form which the tribute took was not silver or gold currency, but goods. He trusted that the result of the discussion would be that the Government would not feel itself hurried by any pressure from India into any wild extravagant schemes for remedying the evil to which we were now subjected. The most plausible of these schemes, and one which had received the sanction of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce, proposed to remedy the present depreciation of silver by raising the price of the rupee, and thus to make it practically a metallic bank note of an appreciated value; but to this there were three objections, each of which was conclusive. In the first place, no benefit would be gained, because to raise the value of the rupee would not enable one to buy gold on better terms; secondly, it would be impossible to carry out the scheme, because there would be forgeries to an enormous extent in America and elsewhere, which would have the result of bringing the rupee down to its normal value; and, thirdly, it would be dishonest towards all who had to pay debts in India. He begged to thank the House for listening attentively to his remarks on so technical a branch of the subject.

MR. E. NOEL said, there was nothing he should hail with greater delight than a retrenchment of the expenditure by the Indian Government, as he thought that was the only way to enable them to do without levying fresh taxation. It had been argued that the cotton duty in India was a protective duty, kept on to sustain an artificial manufacture. If that were really the statement of the case there was no man who would more strongly oppose it than he would; but he had not heard any argument in support of that view. He was ready to admit that the speeches of the hon. Member for Staleybridge (Mr. Sidebottom) and the hon. Member for Blackburn (Mr. Briggs) were exceedingly honest and able. They both urged on the Government the repeal of the Indian import duties for the benefit of the Lancashire manufacturers and operatives.. But he contended that in discussing the Indian Budget they were bound rather to consider how any particular tax affected the Indian people than how it affected the interests of English manufacturers. The question was not whether this tax was a bad one. He would admit that it was bad; but, at the same time, there was no tax that was good, and before they took off a tax in the interests of England they were bound to consider whether they could do so to the advantage of the Indian people. He thought there were taxes levied in India that pressed more hardly upon the Natives than the cotton duty, and he hoped the Government would not interfere with it until they could do so in fairness to the Indian people. He should not like it to go out to India that it was wished in this country to keep down the development of the natural resources of India in the interests of the English cotton manufacturers. The first question they had to deal with was this—could they supply the place of the 5 per cent duty by any other tax which would press less hardly on the Natives of India?

MR. BIRLEY said, he thought the hon. Member who had just sat down entirely misapprehended the argument of his hon. Friend the Member for Staleybridge (Mr. Sidebottom), and all that had happened during the last eventful year in Lancashire relative to this branch of Indian finance. It had been repeatedly said that the manufacturers of Lancashire were jealous of the natural advantages which India offered for the manufacture of cotton. Now they made no complaint on that score; but they did complain that a duty which was undoubtedly protective should be retained by the influence of the Imperial Government entirely contrary to those principles of Free Trade which had prevailed in this country for the last 30 years. How could they lecture foreign countries on their Protectionist policy or negotiate Commercial Treaties if they retained this obnoxious duty in India? If he could have brought the question forward on a substantive Motion earlier in the Session, he would have endeavoured to do it more justice than was now possible. He would, however, advert to the arguments of the Hon. Mr. Hope, Commissioner of Customs at Bombay, who contended that the state of Indian finances demanded the retention of the duty; that it was easily collected; that it occasioned no discontent; that it was drawn chiefly from one description of cotton; that it was light; that it was neither prohibitive nor protective; and that the only remedy it would be expedient to resort to would be a countervailing duty on Indian manufactures. Of course, if the amount of the duty was required it must be retained, until by economy we could spare that £800,000; and the revenue was, on the whole, expansive, having increased 25 per cent since 1860. The other arguments were essentially protectionist, and a free trader could not use them to maintain the duty. Duties on refined sugar or on silk manufactures would in many respects be convenient at home, but we had taken too firm a stand on free trade to entertain them. That the duty was neither prohibitory nor protectionist the hon. Member controverted by going into figures to show how it affected the manufacturer, falling as it did on a fraction of a quarter of the cost of the manufactured article; and its effect was proved by the fact that during the last 10 or 12 years it had almost driven the coarser productions of this country out of the market. He denied that it was wise to levy an Excise duty on the productions of the Indian mills. Every Manchester manufacturer would most strenuously object to any such policy. Although the Indian consumer did not make any complaint, he had to pay £800,000, from which he ought to be freed. Our manufactures were not expanding to the extent they ought; and we must remember what Adam Smith told us, that a very small advantage would enable the foreigner to supplant the home manufacturer even in his own market.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR held that there were only four ways of getting over the present financial difficulties of India—to increase the existing revenues, by making them more productive, or to levy new taxes, to reduce the expenditure, or to borrow money; and, perhaps, all these modes might wisely be followed, except by levying new taxes. His own opinion was that economies could be largely effected in all branches of civil and military charges, both in India and in England; for the Home Charges showed that year by year the outlays for the purely Home Administration had been on the increase, and in a form quite unnecessary. Those increases were entirely separate from those which arose out of the demands sent from India, and which had largely swelled up the total outlay at home, so as to lessen the charges which ought to be shown in the Indian accounts, and increased the loss which had for several years appeared in the accounts for the remittance of funds to pay those large demands. And as regarded the military expenditure, there also the same practices had been resorted to of putting into the Home accounts some considerable charges which ought to have appeared in the Indian accounts, and of even transferring some charges in India to other accounts, so as to make the military outlay less than formerly. That was a practice open to the grave objection of making the present military expenditure appear, in comparison with that of 13 and 14 years ago, far more favourable than it really was, for charges to a considerable amount were now omitted which were formerly entered in the military outlay. But taking the whole of the present military charges in the Home and in the Indian accounts, he considered that £1,000,000 at least might easily be saved in the military expenditure. There were many openings for giving practical effect to that. No one who had studied the accounts for a series of years could fail to form the opinion that the outlay on military stores had been enormous; this could be shown by calculating the rate of store charge per head of the number of men maintained in India. Even admitting that changes in armaments of guns and arms had been frequent, yet the sums spent for new stores ought to have rendered the maintenance of these new arms and field-pieces far less costly. Then, again, the outlay on beer had certainly given an average consumption per man far in excess of the quantity which each man out of hospital and effective, out of the number of Europeans kept up, could afford to pay for out of his pay. The Staff of the Army of India was maintained on a costly scale, and Staff officers in various Departments multiplied in a way which was not only costly, but must multiply the office work of the battalions and regiments of Cavalry and Infantry, and of batteries of Artillery. Then, again, the Home Charges for the pay of officers at home and for supplying recruits were enormous, owing to the system followed by the War Office in raising and training men for India. The service of India was so much liked that recruits could always be obtained, so that none of the outlays needed for raising men for the Army generally should be debited to India. It was said to have been on grounds of public policy that the late Secretary of State for India (Viscount Halifax) deprived India of the European forces of the Indian Army, making India depend on the Home Army for the European portion of its garrison, and England ought not now to make the finances of India bear the burden of charges arising out of Home experiments to provide an Army for the Home defence. Then the organizations of battalions of Infantry, of regiments of Cavalry, and of brigades and batteries of Artillery, were all calculated to multiply establishments and Staff charges, as also officers, especially those of the higher ranks, as to cause great and unnecessary charges to fall on the revenues of India. The great objection to these expensive formations was that they were not those best suited for India, nor were they of the strengths actually fixed for the Army at home when taking the field. If due consideration were given to the real wants of India, or even to the rules for the field Army in Europe, then the Line regiments might be reduced from 50 to 39 battalions, the nine regiments of Cavalry might be reduced to six, and the number of batteries in the Artillery might also be reduced. That could be done without impairing the efficiency of the Army, or of cutting off even a single Infantry private, Cavalry trooper, or gunner of the Artillery, and the money gain to India would be very great. He was as much in favour as any man could be of efficiency, but retrenchment was now so necessary, in the face of an enormous deficiency of the income, to meet the present Indian expenditure, that it was the duty of England to aid India in effecting those economies which were so practicable and so necessary. They had had, in the course of this debate, the claims from Lancashire to have the duties now levied in India on the manufactures of Manchester removed from the tariff; but he thought that one thing was certain, that of all embarrassments to which India had been subject, that of financial embarrassment was her greatest difficulty in past times, and would be hereafter. The trade of India might be put on a proper footing by measures of a far more comprehensive character than those proposed by Lancashire, and calculated to extend commerce, and which would also relieve the finances of that country. If the Government removed only the Indian import duty on cotton goods and cotton twist, as had been advocated, that reduction would amount to a sum of £900,000, and there would only remain a sum from the import duties kept on of £800,000, principally raised from import duties on three of the 52 classes of goods now subject to import duties, so that if the claims from Manchester were attended to in favour of their particular trade, then, having regard to the claims of other traders there, these, as well as the duties on all the other 47 classes of goods, might then be advantageously reduced also. Of all services that could be rendered to the people of India and to the finances, he considered that the repeal of the remaining export duties on the few articles of Native produce would be the greatest. What was specially needed at the present time was an increase of exports from India—indeed, greater commercial activity in imports as well as exports—for of late years the uniform value of about £100,000,000 of imports and exports had been maintained; it was desirable to quicken trade, and no mode was so well calculated to do so than by removing all duties and Customs on trade and salt, trusting to the enormous commercial increase which India was capable of, for augmenting the other revenues; but reciprocity between India and this country was not only fair, but politic. The House was told of the large capital of this country invested in the looms of England which manufactured cottons for India, but £13,000,000 was also invested in the tea plantations of India. From these, 25,000,000 lbs. to 28,000,000 lbs. of tea were exported from India, and we levied at home upon that tea, which nearly all came to England, an amount of duty nearly equal to the duty levied in India upon the cotton goods of Manchester. Yet the cotton manufacturers in that House and out of it, who had claimed the reduction of the Indian import duty on cotton goods, had never complained of the duty levied in England on Indian tea. The same remarks would apply to the coffee grown in India by British capital, which paid a high duty in this country. If both these duties now charged at home on only two Indian products were added up, the amount would equal, if not exceed, the duties on Manchester goods levied in India; in fact, if England only practised the principles of free trade now recognized as sound, then the trade of India and of England would be freed from the war of tariffs which they now carried on, though he denounced that war when carried on by other foreign countries. Much stress had been laid on the loss now sustained by Indian revenues owing to the great difference between the money that could now be obtained in England on bills drawn on India for silver rupees deliverable in India for those English bills. But that loss ought to have been foreseen. The Government had been unnecessarily increasing the Home Charges, and had been changing their entire policy of making railways through private companies, and doing the work out of Government funds, thereby closing up a great source for funds being obtainable at home for Indian purposes. Then one of the greatest of all causes for diminishing the wants of India for silver was in the substitution of a paper currency for silver coins, which had been going on during the last 15 years, and so lessening the requirements of India for silver. Having been in India, and officially connected with some of the details about the introduction of notes, he begged to explain to the House that when he was at the head of the military finance of India, Mr. Wilson, to whose ability he bore warm testimony, came out as Minister of Finance, and took great interest in the currency of India. At that date there was but little or no paper currency in use beyond the three Presidency towns of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, and all the payments made in the interior were discharged by silver coins, for gold was entirely locked up, either hoarded or in ornaments; the cumbersome nature of these silver payments was so great as to be a burden to Government and an obstruction to traders. Among Mr. Wilson's plans was that of a paper currency for India, and it was intimately connected with the present silver question. The silver currency was then one of the greatest difficulties of India, for there was a great tendency for coins to get into out of the way places, and to be collected in masses, to the serious detriment of other places, often deprived of the means of exchange and obliged to resort to shells in some places for an exchangeable article. Indeed, one of the greatest difficulties of the Army in India was in their guarding the silver in its transit from one part of India to another distant part; and that troublesome duty was, in the opinion of the Native Army, a cause of great annoyance and a great grievance, and had actually constituted one of the elements that led to the Indian Mutiny. Well, Mr. Wilson's plans had for their object the substitution of a paper currency for a silver one, and when the hon. Member for Orkney (Mr. Laing) took charge of the Indian finances, he wisely and well perfected Mr. Wilson's scheme, and succeeded in doing away with the operation of shifting the silver coins from one part of India to another, so that the large amounts which formerly became locked up in distant localities, thus contributing to multiply the value and quantity, now no longer existed. The paper currency had now so cut down the silver circulating medium that it had been stated that night to be only about half the value it was formerly calculated to have been. The effect of the paper currency had been to economize the use of silver coins and thereby to lessen the quantity in use, and to diminish the necessity for silver in payments. Paper notes of varied denominations, from 5 rupees to 10,000 rupee notes, had been manufactured, and though the quantities in actual circulation on any given date only amounted in value to £12,000,000 or £13,000,000, still the value of notes printed and used in the year was quadrupled, so that the use of notes, and the facilities afforded by the Government in exchanging these notes for silver coins in any of the circles, irrespective of the legal right to have them cashed by the public Treasuries throughout the whole of India, had so largely diminished the silver coins as to reduce the circulation by one-half. The diminution of silver imported into India and the relatively small extent of coinage at the Mints of India proved that the silver currency had been decreased. The silver imports being mainly used for coinage, the people had probably melted up the coins for the ornaments which were so extensively used by the women and children of many millions in India. He contended that until such time as the necessary amount of silver for ornaments was restored to the people of India by increased imports, so long was depreciation in that commodity sure to continue. This demand for silver imports could only be created by the increase in the trade of India, especially by inducing exports to be largely augmented. That could be effected by enabling the produce of India to compete with the products of other countries. Freedom from Customs and taxes and cheapening transport would soon raise the trade of India on such a scale as to need a much larger currency of both paper and silver, as well as of increased imports of bullion, and by these means the loss now suffered in raising funds at home would soon be wiped off. There was one other question which required to be noticed, and that was in respect to the position of the Viceroy and Secretary of State. He considered the claims put forward from India of independence of the Secretary of State and Parliament were outrageous, and he hoped that the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury), or whoever might be his successor in the office which he held, would exercise his power temperately, but firmly to cut down that extravagant demand which was so much, in his opinion, to the discredit of our Indian administration.

MR. GOSCHEN having observed that the noble Lord the Under-Secretary for India, at the conclusion of his clear and eloquent speech, invited the assistance of the House in the solution of the many important questions on which he had touched, said, he wished to comply with that invitation by making a few remarks on that especially which was connected with the depreciation of silver, in reference to which some able and instructive speeches had been made, and in particular that by the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), which was so clear and exhaustive on the subject that it left little for other hon. Members to say upon it. He fully appreciated the cordial recognition given by the noble Lord to the labours of the Committee on the depreciation of silver; and he thought the noble Lord and the Government would best show their sense of the services which had been rendered by that Committee by continuing, if it was in their power, the inquiry which that Committee had undertaken. He felt sure that the noble Lord, who showed the greatest interest—he might almost say devotion—in the pursuit of the investigation, would take steps to have it still further carried out with the utmost care by means of examination at the India Office as well as in some of the other Government Departments. Those who had read the Report of the Committee would have seen that portion of their information had been received from foreign sources, and especially from America and Germany, and he hoped our Representatives all over Europe as well as in America would be instructed to continue to send home elaborate and careful Reports with respect to what was being done in connection with a subject so important. In dealing with it it should not be forgotten that there were two points which were deserving of special attention—depreciation and fluctuation—and that a great many of the evils which we had to deplore in the matter resulted, not so much from depreciation, but from the constant fluctuations in a commodity which had been made over a vast area the standard of value. That fluctuation, then, should be carefully watched, because it must be regarded as one of the main elements in guiding the Government as to the measures which they should adopt in the present emergency in India. Were, for instance, the remedies to be sought from that country or not? Was it necessary that Government should revise their contracts with the Indian Civil Service, or ought such a question be entertained by them as had been mentioned that evening already—the revision of the land tax? and it would be matter for consideration as to whether the existing depreciation of silver was to be regarded as permanent, or whether we might expect a reaction. He should be glad, he might add, to learn whether the Government had in their possession any Reports from Washington as to the steps which had been taken by the American Government with regard to the Bills on the subject of a silver currency which had been introduced into their Legislature. If the Government had received any despatches on the subject from their Consuls during the last six months, he should wish to be allowed to move for their production. The statistics the Committee collected with regard to produce of American mines practically ended with the year 1875. They had, indeed, further information for another three months from a gentleman who had received a kind of officious authority from the French Government to report to them on the produce of these celebrated mines. Her Majesty's Government would, however, be able to continue to obtain information on this vital point, and the produce of these mines must be watched with the greatest anxiety if we wished to form a correct opinion as to the future price of silver. It had been stated that these mines were producing half in gold and half in silver, and attention had likewise been called to the fact, which was of paramount importance, that the mines were alleged to pay themselves simply by the gold which they produced, and that the silver was practically produced without cost. M. Léon Say, the French Minister of Finance, had drawn the same conclusions from that fact, as the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) had done, that by these mines being able to produce silver so cheaply they could drive all other mines out of the market. This raised the second question which he would venture to put to Her Majesty's Government — namely, whether they would endeavour to ascertain what effect the great fall in the value of silver had had upon its production in Mexico, South America, and other countries where there were silver mines? He thought, on the whole, that possibly sufficient importance had not hitherto been attached to this question of the effect upon other mines than these American mines of the great fall in the value of silver. He should say that if the prices of silver remained at their present point we must expect to see a decided falling off in some of the sources of supply. Then, again, it would be interesting to know what progress had been made in Germany with regard to the sale of the surplus stocks. We knew how the matter rested up to the end of June, but every month must throw fresh light on the subject, and therefore he should be glad if Her Majesty's Government would state whether they had any further information on the subject. From France he had received information that they were not increasing their stock of silver in the Bank of France, which meant that the depreciation of silver was not producing the effect of driving silver into the Bank of France while the gold was withdrawn. From this fact the French drew the inference that there was no great surplus stock in France. He hoped the Government would continue to give their closest attention to this subject, and would keep our Embassies and Ministers abroad up to the mark in reporting upon this question. It would be most interesting to hon. Members when they met again in February to know they had got the latest and most authentic information. He would now advert to another point—namely, the effect of the fall in the price of silver upon the trade of India. It did not follow that a depreciation in the fall of silver or a great increase in the production of silver must necessarily be an evil to any country, from the fact that the discovery of a valuable commodity added to the wealth of the world. It was clear we should only be able to obtain the silver now produced by paying for it in some way or other; and if our trade with one country should diminish we might look for the development of new branches of trade with other countries resulting from the remarkable discoveries on the West Coast of America. Already a new trade was springing up between China and the West Coast of America, and when such developments occurred this country, through its great commercial ascendancy, always managed to secure a part of the new trade. While, therefore, our manufacturers and merchants now had to encounter serious drawbacks, compensation might be in store for them through an increase of trade, not, indeed, commensurate with that brought about by the discoveries of gold, but commensurate with the causes which were bringing about a fall in the price of silver. The question which naturally arose was whether this fall had reached its lowest point and whether a rise might be expected? Now, his Colleagues on the Committee would confirm him in the statement that, after all their deliberations, they had failed to arrive at any conclusion upon that point. The fact was that the causes were so complicated and it was so impossible to measure the extent to which they might operate that he would be a bold man who ventured upon any prophecy. The noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) was hopeful, and looked forward to a rise in the price of silver in the course of this year. The noble Lord spoke somewhat too strongly of the panic which had occurred, because he (Mr. Goschen) was inclined to agree that the causes now at work justified the apprehensions which were felt as to the fall in silver. On the other hand, his hon. Friend (Mr. Fawcett) seemed to draw the picture in very dark colours. For himself, he wished to be excused from giving any opinion as to whether silver was likely to fall or rise; but he should like to add one or two considerations to those enumerated in the Report of the Committee. As regarded the causes which were hostile to the value of silver, it might be assumed that, except as to the extent to which the silver mines in America might yield increased amounts, we now knew the worst. We knew the worst also as regarded the drafts of the Indian Government upon India, and the policy which had been announced secured this advantage from the disturbed relations between gold and silver in India—namely, that the Government had been obliged to face the question of Indian expenditure in a bold manner which would lead to permanent results. As to Germany, we knew approximately the amount of silver there. The action of the Latin Union and of those States which still had a silver currency in Europe was an open question; but should silver rise, or should things not grow worse, there seemed to be no disposition on the part of those Governments to substitute a gold for a silver currency. In the French Chambers, where the subject had been repeatedly debated, the Minister of Finance was in favour of an expectant attitute, but on the whole argued for the maintenance of the double standard; and there did not seem to be even a strong probability of the substitution of gold for silver entirely. The French Minister of Finance made a pregnant observation upon the difference between the fluctuation in silver and the depreciation of silver, pointing out that the mere fall in value was no argument against maintaining the system of a double currency to which they were attached in France, though it might require a re-consideration of the legal relation between gold and silver. He (Mr. Goschen) offered no opinion upon the value of this argument. He simply pointed to it as an indication that there did not seem to be any immediate fear that the French Government would take steps to demonetize silver. The supplies were very large, but the removals to the purchasing countries had been very considerable. These were causes strongly operating on this question and amply accounting for and justifying the alarm and the fall that had occurred. They must turn to the considerations which were on the other side — namely, the circumstances which might be expected to influence the price of silver in the other direction; but there they had this difficulty—they knew but little. They knew there were a number of indefinite causes which might produce a rise in the price of silver, but they were less able to measure them. Before he dealt specially with the case of India he would point to the enormous area over which the silver currency existed, and which might have a capacity for absorbing silver which they were unable to gauge. He thought there could be no better illustration of the chances of recovery in silver than what had, as he was informed, recently occurred in China. There, quite an unexpected demand for silver had arisen within the last few days. Great speculation in silver which no one had foreseen had arisen, and he was told that while here there had been such a glut of silver that everybody was alarmed, in China there was a panic with regard to the inability of procuring sufficient silver to purchase the silk at enhanced prices. The hon. Member for Hackney spoke—and it was one of the most interesting parts of his speech—of the effect which the fall in the value of silver would have on the export trade of India, and he traced very clearly how a fall in silver encouraged export, and how that would greatly tend to increase the price of commodities in India, and that then the cause would cease to operate and the finances of India would be left in a deplorable condition. But the hon. Gentleman did not complete his argument, for he should have pointed out that the increased flow of silver from England to India would produce a rise in the price of silver in England. Therefore, while the export trade was being developed, so also in this country there would be a rise in the price of silver as a result. This would necessitate the employment of a larger amount of silver in this country, and the consequence was that cause and effect would re-act upon each other. Already, it seemed, natural causes were beginning to operate; and he warned the Government and the public that no measures were more detrimental in restoring the price of silver than any courses tending to operate against silver. Speaking of the rise of price in India, he would add that there were some points on which he hoped the Government would collect information during the Recess. That was one of the points on which the Report was weakest, for the Committee could not collect the necessary materials in the time at their disposal. It would be curious to observe what the effect of the results of the past four years had been in connection with the fall of the price of silver in India. He had seen statistics which seemed to indicate that prices had by no means risen anything like the proportion in which silver had fallen in this country. It was most unlikely that such should be the case. The fall was distributed over so wide an area that the rise could not be otherwise than very gradual. The question of the rise in prices in India would be one to which the Government must give special and peculiar attention. It had been argued that it would be impossible or difficult to impose any fresh taxes on India or to increase existing ones. But if prices rose the ryots and other producers would receive increased prices for their articles and be able to pay increased taxes in the same proportion. From every point of view, however, the question of the adjustment of prices in India was one which demanded the closest attention of the Government. That there was an emergency no one who had followed the course of events or listened to the speech of the noble Lord could doubt. The noble Lord had shown clearly its effect on the revenues of India, on the tribute paid to this country on salaries, &c. About the £15,000,000 paid annually by India to this country he wished to say a word. No part of the statement of the noble Lord was more interesting than that which analyzed the mode in which that heavy charge was raised and the effect it produced on the finances of the Government. He showed how great a portion of that charge had arisen from guaranteed railways and from advances made to the Government for public works. From this subject he (Mr. Goschen) believed a useful moral might be drawn for the guidance of Governments generally. The Indian Government believed it was embarking in a simple transaction of lending for which it would receive a good return. It raised money in this country, and expected a return for it in India. It did not foresee that the operation, which lay somewhat beyond the necessary functions of a Government, would entail in the end a vast loss upon the Indian Exchequer. That, however, was the result, a large debt which had been contracted in gold having to be paid by a country that produced only silver. The Government should resist the constant tendency that there was for them to step beyond their proper function, and to embark in undertakings of almost a commercial character; and, indeed, there was now a sort of undertaking that no further addition in this direction should be made beyond what was absolutely necessary for extraordinary works. Borrowing had been mentioned, but he did not think that they could overcome the difficulty into which they had got by borrowing even upon a larger scale. He would not criticize in any hostile spirit the raising of the loan of £4,000,000; but he could not allow that the raising of this loan had anything more than a mere temporary effect, and that its natural tendency would be to check the natural causes that were now beginning to cause a fall in the price of silver. The noble Lord very properly described it as an artificial means of keeping up the exchanges for the time being; but he used dangerous language when he said that the Government wished to maintain the exchanges in order to avoid a perturbation in commerce. The recovery, he believed, had not occurred in consequence of that loan, but in consequence of the great demand for silver which had sprung up in consequence of the cheapness of produce. The noble Lord had referred very briefly to a remedy which appeared to be in considerable favour in very influential quarters—namely, the limitation of the coining of rupees. When Parliament separated it was very possible that the demand for that remedy might be revived, for it had been advocated in several Chambers of Commerce. The object of limiting the manufacture of rupees was clearly to maintain the exchange—that was to say, to give those who already possessed or had a claim to coined rupees a monopoly which the holders of other silver had not. What would be the result of that? He could fancy that the Indian Council might say —he trusted they would not—"We are in this position. We have claims on India to the extent of £15,000,000 sterling in coined rupees. India owes us this money, and must pay it, not in silver, but in coined rupees. If, therefore, no further rupees are coined, we shall keep up the price of the article of which we have this monopoly." The Indian Government, or the Home Government, or the holders of the debt, might, therefore, appear to have a momentary advantage in maintaining the rupee at that price. A large number of Manchester or other manufacturers might be in precisely the same position; they might have large sums owing to them in India for the goods they had sold, and the amount due to them would have to be paid in coined rupees. Consequently, if by any means the value of the coined rupee must be maintained, they would receive in return that to which an artificial value had been given—namely, a piece of coined silver. But to limit the coinage of silver would practically be to demonetize silver as a metal; and then all those in India who had debts to pay could only obtain coined rupees with which to pay them by buying them at a constantly enhancing price from those who possessed them. They could not discontinue the coining of rupees without providing some currency; and what would that currency be? Could India be left without those means of legal tender which every country required? In France and Holland there was a double standard, so that if those who owed money were unable to get their silver coined, they could not get their gold coined. But that would not be the position of India —at all events, at present. There were powerful advocates of the introduction of a gold currency into India; but he had never seen any practical mode suggested for carrying it out. The interesting process which had been going on in Germany since 1871 in connection with a change of currency might afford them a very instructive lesson on that subject. The difficulties of that operation had been enormous in Germany, and must be far greater in a country like India. Germany was close to all the gold markets of Europe, was in constant banking relations with its neighbours, and had a population more or less accustomed to banking expedients, which all facilitated such a transaction as that. India was in an entirely different position. But, further, if it were put to the intelligent majority in Germany whether they had gained by the substitution of gold for silver, he doubted whether the answer would, on the whole, be in the affirmative. What the advocates of those changes of currency looked to was what might be called the international currency, or the means of settling the great mercantile transactions between one country and another. But the currency had an equal important function internally, and they had to consider, not only whether the trade of India with other countries would be facilitated by the adoption of a gold currency, but what would be the feelings of the population of India in having gold instead of silver. In Germany and France it was certain that the great bulk of the population preferred silver to gold, and it would, he thought, be found that in countries with small laborious populations a silver currency was always most acceptable. He could conceive no policy more unsound or inexpedient than that a change of currency should be forced upon a country which did not desire it. There was scarcely a country in the East in which the people were not accustomed to a silver currency and in which it would be a dangerous experiment to force a change from silver to gold. The financial difficulties attending such a change would be enormous. Germany began by amassing, through the power which the payment of an enormous indemnity gave her, an immense stock of gold. Then came the question at what rate the exchange took place from silver to gold, so that in the transaction no injustice would be done to debtor and creditor. The exchange was finally settled at 15½—that was, the value of silver relatively to gold was taken at 15½, and contracts that were made in the one standard were made legal in the other. By the fall in the value of silver the German Government had sustained a great loss in the operation. Although the exchange of silver was now 17½, they were now obliged to give gold at the exchange of 15½. At what rate, he asked, would the gold standard be introduced in India? Was the rupee to be taken at 1*s.* 10*d.* or 2*s.*, for this would make an enormous difference on a circulation of £100,000,000, and the loss would be still greater by the fall in price which the operation would occasion in India as it did in Germany? The proportions of the question were gigantic, and it deserved the grave consideration of Her Majesty's Government before any decision was finally arrived at. There was one other point to which he wished to call attention. There was at the present moment a great plethora of gold in the Banks of England and France, but that had not always been the case, and he would be a bold man who would withdraw silver from that partnership with gold, by means of which a sufficient supply was furnished to do the currency for the whole globe. The Germans had the great advantages which the depression of trade gave them at a moment when they were making their conversion. We had seen, he might add, the results of a great increase in the supply of gold, but we had not seen what the results would be of the withdrawal of a large mass of money from the currency of the world. There appeared to him to be considerations which disposed of the expediency of such an immense operation as the adoption of a gold currency in India; and he trusted the Government would speak with no uncertain sound on the matter, as any illusion with regard to it would only tend further to disturb a market which was already so agitated. Both in this country and in India it was better to bear fluctuations than to take a step which it would be difficult to retrace and which might produce evils the result of which it was impossible to foresee. He was quite satisfied with the declarations of the noble Lord, made, he hoped, on the part of the Government, on the subject, and was glad of the opportunity which had been afforded of discussing the matter, so that during the Recess no misconception could exist.

Mr. GRANT DUFF congratulated the noble Lord opposite on having made, under painful and exceptional circumstances, a statement about Indian finance, as satisfactory as the language in which it was expressed was clear and graceful. He must also congratulate him on the discussion which a few days ago occurred in "another place," which proved clearly that if a distinguished public man who had lately returned from serving his country in India had been in a position to hold once a-week a conversation with the Secretary of State, the divergence of view between those two eminent men would be found to have been very small indeed, and that there was no desire to establish between the Government at home and that in India relations which must sooner or later end in national calamity. Passing to another subject, he agreed to a great extent with the general conclusions to which some of the Lancashire Representatives who had addressed the House had come; but he thought they would have shown more of the wisdom of the serpent if they had argued their case from the Indian and not from the English side. He objected to drawing a sharp line, as had been done by one speaker, between the interests of England and of India. These interests were far indeed from being necessarily antagonistic, or anything like it. He could not pretend to have more interest in Lancashire than in any other county of the United Kingdom, but he had a very strong interest in India; and, looking at the matter from the Indian side, he wished to see the gradual disappearance not only of the cotton duties, but of all Indian import and export duties whatever. Of course, in the present state of affairs, the Indian Exchequer could not be asked to part with any source of revenue whatever, good or bad; but when better times came, he trusted that Indian financiers would steadily keep in view two objects of paramount importance, the equalization of the salt tax, and the gradual abolition of Customs duties. He deeply regretted the agitation which had led to the giving up of the income tax. He should have liked to have seen the income tax kept at 2 per cent, and used for the attainment of that end. It was very unfortunate that we had allowed our Colonies to wander so far as they had done from the paths of free trade. He knew, of course, that circumstances had been very adverse when we had allowed our Colonies to do so; but our relations to India were not the same as our relations to our Colonies, and it would be truly deplorable if, because a little temporary inconvenience might be caused, we were not steadily to keep in view the freeing of Indian trade from all shackles. That was a goal to which we should continually tend, if without haste, yet without rest.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, the tone of the debate being so much in favour of the policy of the Government, he should not detain the House by any lengthened speech in reply to the suggestions and criticisms that had been offered. He assured the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen) that his suggestions would receive the most careful consideration of the Government. With respect to his noble Friend's (Lord Salisbury's) action in reference to the Indian tariff he could assure the House that it was not any imperious dictation to the Indian Government, but was necessitated by the fact that his despatch disapproving of the principles of that tariff did not arrive in India until after the tariff had been adopted by the Governor General's Council, and had the Secretary of State sanctioned it he would have been in the position of supporting a measure of which he did not approve. He hoped the hon. Member for Staleybridge (Mr. Sidebottom) would not press his Resolution, for it was impossible, under the present circumstances, to dispense with duties that produced a revenue of £800,000 a-year. He agreed with many of the views expressed by the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), who was justified in suggesting the curtailment of public works which were to be constructed by means of loans, and he fully agreed with the hon. Member in his condemnation of borrowing for the construction of such works in this country. The Amendment of the hon. Member was an abstract Resolution, and although he thought it went in the right direction, the danger was that circumstances might arise which could not be foreseen, and the abstract Resolution, if adopted, might seriously embarrass the action of the Government. He therefore hoped it would not be pressed to a division.

Mr. SIDEBOTTOM said, after the appeal of the noble Lord he would not move his Resolution.

Colonel JERVIS, who had on the Paper an Amendment on the hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Fawcett's) Amendment, said, he would not move it at that late hour, but hoped the noble Lord would consider the subject with which it dealt during the Recess.

Mr. FAWCETT said, after the appeal which had been made to him by the Under Secretary for India he should withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Matter *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1875 was £50,570,171; the charges in India, including the collection of the Revenue, Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £40,760,583; the charges in England (including £1,595,878, the value of Stores supplied to India) were £8,245,829; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £1,244,562, making a total charge for the same year of £50,250,974; and there was an excess of Income over Expenditure in that year amounting to £319,197; that the charge for Public Works extraordinary was £2,249,571, and that, including that charge, the excess of Expenditure over Income was £3,930,374.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

NORWICH AND BOSTON (CORRUPT VOTERS) BILL—[BILL 244.]

(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. INGRAM said, he considered it a hardship that certain men had been selected for punishment, while others, who were the principals, were allowed to go scot free. He should like to know the reasons which had induced the Government to adopt this course?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, the Bill had been introduced in consequence of the Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the cases of the borough of Boston and the city of Norwich. All that this Bill proposed to do with regard to Boston was to disfranchise the scheduled persons for seven years. With respect to Norwich the Commissioners reported that corrupt practices prevailed at the elections of 1874 and 1875, and that a great number of voters were colourably employed. But at no other election since 1860 had corrupt practices extensively prevailed. Therefore, the Government thought the case would be met by providing that no fresh writ should issue for Norwich during the present Parliament, and that those persons whose names were scheduled should be unable to vote for a Member of Parliament for seven years.

MR. COLMAN said, he should not at that late hour of the evening, or he might say at that late period of the Session, delay the House by making more than a few remarks before going into Committee on the Bill. He was glad that the task he had to perform was a simple one. He had placed an Amendment on the Paper; but he thought after the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General, in reference to the Bill before the House, it would not be necessary for him to say very much. But he wished just to point out in reference to the Norwich elections that though some rather questionable circumstances had happened in that city, there were some boroughs which were comparatively free from much political excitement that might be contrasted with Norwich without much disparagement to the city he represented. Certainly it might be said that there were some exceptional causes in Norwich owing to the strong personal feeling that existed in reference to one of the candidates. He said this, not to excuse anything that had happened of an improper nature, but rather to explain some of the exciting scenes that had been brought before the country in the Report of the Commissioners. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General had said that the Report of the Commissioners came to this—and he (Mr. Colman), for one, frankly expressed his regret for it—that at the last two elections in Norwich, there was, according to the phrase used by the Commissioners, "colourable employment." Now, he hoped the House would bear in mind the fact that the cost of an election was, perhaps, a rough, but, at the same time, a very good test of its purity, and that when they found a very costly election, they might be pretty sure that something had been going on that ought not to have been. He was not there to say that the elections in Norwich had been conducted with economy—he was afraid they had not; but he hoped the House would allow him to quote some figures which he had culled from Parliamentary Returns, and in doing so he would refrain from mentioning the names of the places to which the figures referred, as he did not wish to say anything that might lead to unnecessary discussion. There was a borough containing 23,000 voters—and he might here say that something turned on the size of a constituency—in which the money spent on behalf of the different candidates averaged 8*s.* 10*d.* per voter. In another containing a constituency of 20,000, the average per voter was 9*s.* 1*d.*; in a third, with a constituency of 7,000, where there were two candidates, the cost was 11*s.* 3*d.* per head; in a fourth, with a constituency of 23,000, the expenditure was 13*s.* 9*d.* per voter; in a fifth, where there were 6,000 voters, the cost was 16*s.* 2*d.* per head; and in another borough, with not much over that number of constituents, the cost was 23*s.* per voter. Well, after these figures, he wished to call the attention of the House to the expenses at Norwich. In that city the cost was put at 11*s.* 6*d.* per voter; but in this case it should be remembered that the expenses were calculated not merely on the published Returns, but also on the outside payments that had been brought before the Royal Commissioners. With regard to these outside payments he heard of them elsewhere. Some hon. Members of that House had told him that in their boroughs and among their constituencies they knew nothing of these outside payments, or that if they were brought before them they refused to pay; but there were places where the outside claims were known and acknowledged, and he must express a hope that the hon. and learned Attorney General, in any Bill he might bring in at any future time in reference to corrupt practices, would turn his attention to this point. His late Colleague (Baron Huddleston), who had gone out of the sphere of that House to a serener one, had explained before the Commissioners the difficulty in which candidates were placed. He pointed out that an agent came and explained that such and such debts had been incurred on his behalf by a friend. Well, it was to be hoped that the House would enact such laws that instead of these charges being met as debts of honour which the candidates were bound to pay, they should be regarded as debts of dishonour, and in that case the country would get rid of a great deal of corruption. He had already given figures showing that Norwich was not to be looked upon as the only black spot on the electoral purity of the country; but he wished, before sitting down, to give another instance to show what could be done where the candidates made up their minds to have an election conducted purely. He would refer to a case of a constituency of 46,000, where the average cost per voter was only 1*s.* 10*d.*; to another where there were 36,700 voters, and the cost was 1*s.* 9*d.* per head; and to a third, where the voters numbered 18,650, and the average cost was only 1*s.* 2½*d.* per head. The last-mentioned case showed such a creditable state of affairs that he thought he might in this particular instance break the rule he had laid down for himself and state that the borough which had the honour of conducting its elections as cheaply as any in England was the borough of Oldham. He would not trouble the House with any lengthened remarks. He had already presented Petitions from some of his constituents, who considered that their case really required some attention, and he had simply to say on their behalf that whilst admitting frankly that Mr. Commissioner M'Mahon agreed substantially with the Report of the other Commissioners, there were among his constituents those who entertained a doubt whether he would have agreed with them as to the precise names that had been put into the Schedule, or as to some of those that had been omitted from it. He had presented Petitions from some who thought that their case was one of peculiar hardship. He had only to say that he fully appreciated the manner in which the Government had treated this question. They had not been disposed to deal harshly with a constituency that had not hitherto been very favourable to them; and he trusted that the constituency he represented might hereafter have the high honour of being pointed out as one of those amongst whom elections were conducted cheaply and purely.

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 11*th August*, 1876.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Bow Street Police Court Site* (228); Expiring Laws Continuance* (229); Sheriff Courts (Scotland)* (222); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation).*

Second Reading—Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment (218)*; Legal Practitioners* (220); Suez Canal (Shares)* (221); War Department and Post Office (Remuneration, &c.)* (219).

Committee—Report—Municipal Privileges (Ireland)* (211); Police (Expenses) Act Continuance* (212); Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment (Dublin)* (213).

Report—Elementary Education* (226); Pollution of Rivers* (227).

Royal Assent—Nullum Tempus (Ireland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 37]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 39]; Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 38]; Medical Practitioners [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 40]; Industrial and Provident Societies [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 45]; Medical Act (Qualifications) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 41]; Slave Trade [39 &

40 *Vict.* c. 46]; Legal Practitioners (Ireland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 44]; Convict Prisons (Returns) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 42]; Isle of Man (Officers) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 43]; Saint Vincent, Tobago, and Grenada Constitution [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 47]; Burghs (Scotland) Gas Supply [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 49]; Bankers Books Evidence [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 48]; Commons [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 56]; Poor Law Rating (Ireland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 50]; Savings Banks (Barrister) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 52]; Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 53]; Bishopric of Truro [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 54]; Parochial Records [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 58]; Winter Assizes [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 57]; Cattle Disease (Ireland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 51]; Appellate Jurisdiction [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 59]; Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 55]; Tralee Savings Bank [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cciv]; Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Cardiff) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cxcvii]; Metropolis (Whitechapel and Limehouse) Improvement Scheme Confirmation [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cc]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bingley, &c.) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cxcviii]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Chelmsford, &c.) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cxcix]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bath, &c.) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cci]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccii]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bilbrough, &c.) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cciii].

TURKEY—STATE OF BULGARIA.

QUESTION.

EARL GRANVILLE asked the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he could give an assurance to the House that when any further information with regard to the state of Bulgaria was received, measures would be taken to circulate it among the Members of their Lordships' House?

THE EARL OF DERBY, in reply, said, it was his intention to act in accordance with the suggestion of the noble Earl. Some Papers on the subject had been already laid on the Table, which he would remind the noble Earl came up to a very recent period.

MERCANTILE MARINE—"FRANCONIA" AND "STRATHCLYDE" COLLISION.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

EARL GRANVILLE, in moving for the Report of Mr. Rothery, Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty, on the conduct of the officers of the "Palmerston" after the collision of the "Franconia" and the "Strathclyde," said, he did not anticipate any opposition to the Motion. It was on a matter which attracted much public attention, and concerning which Questions were asked in Parliament. A charge was brought against those in charge of the tug *Palmerston*, belonging to the Dover Harbour Board, after the loss of the *Strathclyde*, that they had not done their utmost to save the lives of the survivors—a charge especially supported by the evidence of some Deal boatmen, who had themselves been eminently successful in their exertions. The Harbour Board, immediately after the sad accident, made some preliminary inquiries. For a considerable time it was probable that there would be an inquiry into the whole case by the Board of Trade, and the Harbour Board memorialized the Board of Trade to include the conduct of those in charge of the tug *Palmerston* in the inquiry. But other legal proceedings making any inquiry by the Board of Trade unnecessary, the Harbour Board determined to have a separate inquiry. They had doubts about the inquiry being usefully conducted by themselves. No member of the Board possessed the necessary legal and nautical experience and they were open to suspicion of local bias. In these circumstances they applied to Mr. Rothery, the learned Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty, and to two nautical Assessors recommended by the Board of Trade. Mr. Rothery had presented to them a clear and full Report, detailing all the circumstances of the case, and the proceedings by the Court of Inquiry. This Report they had officially transmitted to the Board of Trade. Mr. Rothery, with the full concurrence of the two nautical assessors, acquitted all persons concerned in the management of the *Palmerston* from all blame for the loss of life on the occasion of the loss of the *Strathclyde*, and added an explanation why it was natural that the Deal boatmen, who behaved so gallantly and so successfully in this matter, should have entertained at the time the views which they did as to the conduct of those on board the *Palmerston;* though had they been aware of the real reasons which influenced their conduct, they would have seen how groundless were their suspicions. In conclusion, he would avail himself of that public opportunity to thank Mr. Rothery and the Assessors for the trouble they had taken in the matter, and also to acknowledge the assistance which the Dover Commissioners had received in the matter from the Board of Trade.

Moved, That there be laid before the House, Report of Mr. Rothery, Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty, on the conduct of the officers of the "Palmerston" after the collision of the "Franconia" and the "Strathclyde."—(*Earl Granville.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he had nothing to find fault with in the statement made by his noble Friend, which was perfectly accurate; and he should not oppose the Motion.

Motion *agreed to.*

PARLIAMENTARY AGENCY.

RESOLUTIONS.

LORD REDESDALE rose to move—

"That until the House do make further Orders in accordance with the Report of the Select Committee on Parliamentary Agency, agreed to by the House on the 28th July last, the following Rules be observed by the Officers of the House and by all Parliamentary Agents and Solicitors engaged in prosecuting Proceedings in the House of Lords upon any Petition or Bill."

(Declaration of recognizance.)

"1. No person shall be allowed to act as a Parliamentary Agent until he shall have subscribed a declaration before one of the Clerks in the Private Bill Office, engaging to observe and obey the Rules, Regulations, Orders, and Practice of the House of Lords, and also to pay and discharge from time to time, when the same shall be demanded, all fees and charges due and payable upon any Petition or Bill upon which such Agent may appear; and after having subscribed such declaration and entered into a recognizance or bond (if hereafter required) in the penal sum of 500*l.* conditioned to observe the said declaration, such person shall be registered in a book to be kept in the Private Bill Office, and shall then be entitled to act as a Parliamentary Agent; provided that upon the said declaration, recognizance, or bond and registry, no fee shall be payable."

(Form.)

"2. The declaration before mentioned, and the recognizance and bond, if hereafter required, shall be in such form as the Chairman of Committees may from time to time direct.

"3. One member of a firm of Parliamentary Agents may subscribe the required declaration on behalf of his firm, but the names of all the partners of such firm shall be registered with such declaration, and notice shall be given from time to time to the Clerks of the Private Bill Office of any addition thereto or change therein.

"4. No person shall be allowed to be registered as a Parliamentary Agent unless he is actually employed in promoting or opposing some Private Bill or Petition pending in Parliament.

"5. When any person (not being a Solicitor or Writer to the Signet) applies to qualify himself for the first time to act as a Parliamentary Agent, he shall produce to one of the Clerks of the Private Bill Office a certificate of his respectability from a Member of Parliament, or a Justice of the Peace, or a Barrister-at-Law, or an Attorney or Solicitor."

(Appearance to be entered upon Bills.)

"6. No notice shall be received in the Private Bill Office for any proceeding upon a Petition or Bill until an Appearance to act as the Parliamentary Agent upon the same shall have been entered in the Private Bill Office, in which Appearance shall also be specified the name of the Solicitor (if any) for such Petition or Bill."

(Appearance to be entered on Petitions against Bills.)

"7. Before any party shall be allowed to appear or be heard upon any Petition against a Bill, an Appearance to act as the Parliamentary Agent upon the same shall be entered in the Private Bill Office, in which Appearance shall also be specified the name of the Solicitor and of the Counsel who appear in support of any such Petition (if any Counsel or Solicitor are then engaged), and a certificate of such Appearance shall be delivered to the Parliamentary Agent to be produced to the Committee Clerk."

(A fresh Appearance on change of Parliamentary Agent.)

"8. In case the Parliamentary Agent for any Petition or Bill shall be displaced by the Solicitor thereof, or such Parliamentary Agent shall decline to act, the responsibility of such Agent shall cease upon a notice being given in the Private Bill Office, and a fresh Appearance shall be entered upon such Petition or Bill."

(Agents personally responsible.)

"9. Every Parliamentary Agent and Solicitor conducting Proceedings in Parliament before the House of Lords shall be personally responsible to the House and to the Chairman of Committees for the observance of the Rules, Orders, and Practice of Parliament, as well as of any Rules which may from time to time be prescribed by the Chairman of Committees, and also for the payment of the fees and charges due and payable under the Standing Orders."

(Chairman of Committees may, on misconduct, prohibit Agent from practising.)

"10. Any Parliamentary Agent who shall wilfully act in violation of the Rules and Practice of Parliament, or of any Rules to be prescribed by the Chairman of Committees, or who shall wilfully misconduct himself in prosecuting any Proceedings before Parliament, shall be liable to an absolute or temporary prohibition to practise as a Parliamentary Agent at the pleasure of the Chairman of Committees; provided that upon the application of such Parliamentary Agent the Chairman of Committees shall state in writing the grounds for such prohibition.

"11. No person who has been suspended or prohibited from practising as a Parliamentary Agent, or struck off the Roll of Solicitors, or disbarred by any of the Inns of Court, shall be allowed to be registered as a Parliamentary Agent without the express authority of the Chairman of Committees.

"12. No written or printed statement relating to any Private Bill shall be circulated within the precincts of the House of Lords without the name of a Parliamentary Agent attached to it, who will be held responsible for its accuracy.

"13. The sanction of the Chairman of Committees in writing is required to every Notice of a Motion prepared by a Parliamentary Agent for dispensing with any Sessional or Standing Order of the House."

"FORM OF DECLARATION.

"WE, the undersigned, do hereby declare, That we respectively intend during the present Session of Parliament to practise as Parliamentary Agents in the prosecuting, promoting, and opposing Private Bills in the House of Lords, and we severally and respectively do hereby engage to observe, submit to, perform, and abide by all and every the Orders, Rules, Regulations, and Practice of the said House, now in force or hereafter from time to time to be made in relation thereto, and also to pay and discharge from time to time when the same shall be demanded all fees, charges, and sums of money due and payable in respect of any Petition, Bill, or other proceeding or matter in or upon which we shall severally and respectively appear as such Agents as aforesaid."

DATE.	NAME.	RESIDENCE and HOUSE of BUSINESS.	WITNESS.

These Rules had long been adopted by the other House of Parliament, though their Lordships had never before had any Orders on this subject, and it would be well to adopt the same Rules, so that both Houses might stand on the same footing until some further regulations were made in accordance with the Report of the Select Committee. Solicitors throughout the country seemed to wish it to be understood that anybody might undertake the duty of conducting a Private Bill through Parliament. Now, that was the greatest possible mistake. The special knowledge and training of a solicitor afforded very little guide in the work of a Parliamentary Agent. It was necessary that a man should have studied and should be accustomed to that work. Up to 1837 the duties of Parliamentary Agents were performed exclusively by the clerks of both Houses. During the railway mania the private business of Parliament increased so much that it became impossible very largely to leave it to the clerks, who accordingly received the option of remaining as clerks or of taking the separate office as Parliamentary Agents. Many of them accepted this office and most efficiently had they performed their duties. Not one of these gentlemen was a solicitor, and but for the special knowledge they possessed, it was impossible that the enormous private business could have been properly got through. He wished it to be understood that Parliament had no object in wishing to limit the number of Parliamentary Agents, or to restrict admission to the Roll, except the object of facilitating the work which came before Parliament, and especially of benefiting the suitors. There was no greater mistake in Parliamentary business than to entrust it to inexperienced agents. The expense to suitors was thereby enormously increased, while the trouble to both Houses was also increased, and the duty was in every way inefficiently performed. Only those who were accustomed to Parliamentary business could express a trustworthy opinion on this point; and though he did not like to claim any knowledge which was not shared by other persons, he thought that a quarter of a century's experience entitled him to express the opinion that, for the sake of suitors in Parliament, it was of the greatest possible importance that Parliament should, if they could, create a body of competent persons to transact the private business, leaving it open to others to come in if they qualified themselves for the work. He did not like to see the belief spread that the proposals of the joint Committee on this subject were hard and objectionable. There was no wish to propose hard rules. The object was that suitors in Parliament might know to whom they could properly entrust their work, and he hoped that next Session both Houses would come to some Resolution which would put the matter upon a proper footing.

Question put thereupon? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative*, and *Ordered* accordingly.

PARLIAMENTARY AGENCY.

Moved that the Chairman of Committees be authorised to enforce all the rules and orders of the House in relation to the conduct of the private business of the House and to the agents and solicitors engaged in prosecuting the same during any prorogation of Parliament.—(*The Lord President.*)

On question, *agreed to.*

PRIVATE BILLS.

Standing Orders 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 23, 26, 33, 34, 36, 38*a*, 43, 56, 58, 60, 62, 66, 67, 89, 104, 122, 123, 127, 133, 138, and 139 *considered*, and amended; and to be *printed* as amended. — (*The Chairman of Committees.*) (No. 232.)

COMPANIES ACTS (1862 AND 1867) AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 218.)

(*The Earl Fortescue.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Earl FORTESCUE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, its object was to amend certain provisions of the Companies Acts of 1862 and 1867, and to alter the law relating to the issuing of the prospectuses of new companies and the publication of balance-sheets and profit and loss statements by companies already established. It was very earnestly desired by the mercantile community, and had received the approval of 160 associated Chambers of Commerce. It provided—first, that prospectuses were not to be issued before a copy signed by the directors had been sent to the registrar, and amongst other provisions a list of allottees was to be sent to each allottee within seven days after the making of an allotment. Companies were also to prepare a report of their proceedings, with the names of the directors and officials, and a balance-sheet annually of profit or loss, to be sent to the address of every registered member of the company seven days before every ordinary meeting of the company, or to deposit it at the company's office. The Bill also provided compulsory powers for carrying out the latter.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl Fortescue.*)

The LORD CHANCELLOR objected to the second reading of the Bill on the ground that the Companies Acts mentioned formed a code of elaborate and important laws which had been framed by the Government of the day after the greatest care and deliberation, and had been the subject of various judicial decisions. It might be very necessary that the provisions of those Acts should be considered and expanded, but then that ought to be done only after due deliberation, because a stone could not be touched without running the risk of pulling down more than it was desirable to disturb. He was sorry to appear as an opponent of the Bill; but, having considered it carefully, he thought it very undesirable that a Bill of that nature should pass at the very end of the Session, when it could not possibly be considered. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Fortescue) said it was ardently desired by the mercantile community; but what opportunity had the mercantile community had of considering its provisions? Some of them were of a most stringent character, and would have such an operation that business could not be conducted at all under them. Many companies were merely private trading companies, and what right had Parliament to assume to regulate the manner in which they should conduct their affairs? He did not underrate the possible importance of the Bill, but it ought not to be passed at the end of the Session, when it could not be considered by those whom it would affect in a very considerable degree.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he was informed that the Bill was one which had the support of the President of the Board of Trade in the other House of Parliament, while the Attorney General had spoken in its favour.

The LORD CHANCELLOR remarked that he had had no communication with the Attorney General on the subject, and he must, therefore, demur to having his authority in support of the Bill quoted on grounds which were not sufficiently well authenticated.

Earl GRANVILLE regretted that there had been no communication between the noble and learned Lord and his hon. and learned Colleague in the other House on the subject, for he looked upon such communications as very useful. He was informed that the Attorney General had stated that the object of the Bill was one which he regarded as beneficial, and he understood that the Secretary of State for the Home Department had gone still further, by observing that the Government withdrew all opposition to the Bill on the ground that the ruin of so many persons might be involved in its not passing.

The Marquess of SALISBURY thought the course pursued by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) in quoting the opinions of Members of the other House on the authority of the reports of what had occurred there was one which was calculated to lead to great inconvenience, for the true elements for forming an opinion on the subject were wanting, unless there were some official and authoritative records of the debates on which to rely. Many strange things passed in the House of Commons after 12 o'clock at night, and it was impossible from the concise, not to say the slipshod, reports of what took place after that hour to know what they were, but it was quite patent that it was impossible at this time of the Session for their Lordships to discuss the Bill.

The LORD CHANCELLOR, while not denying that the whole object and scope of the Bill were most praiseworthy, would not persevere in his objection to it provided the noble Lord in charge of it would agree not to press it beyond the second reading.

Earl GRANVILLE hoped his noble Friend (Earl Fortescue) would be allowed to postpone his Motion until the Government had been able to confer with their Colleagues in the other House as to what took place there on the occasion referred to.

Earl FORTESCUE hoped the measure, if it was not passed now, would be taken up next Session by the Government.

Lord REDESDALE said, it would not be fair to the House and the public that the Bill should be entertained at the very close of the Session. It had been for a long time before the House of Commons, and was not sent up till this late period; and he would remind their Lordships that to-morrow almost all the Ministers had to attend a Privy Council.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON said, he was not prepared to deny the importance of the Bill, but there was not time to give it that consideration which the subject deserved. If the noble Lord opposite (Earl Fortescue) was satisfied with having the Bill read a second time, in order to affirm that the subject required the attention of Parliament, he would assent to that; but unless an assurance was given that the Bill would not be pressed on to future stages, he thought it would be better to negative the Bill.

Earl FORTESCUE assented to the proposal of the noble Duke.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative;* Bill read 2ª accordingly.

House adjourned at half past Eleven
o'clock, till To-morrow,
One o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 11*th August,* 1876.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills — *Committee — Report*—Cruelty to Animals [250].

Committee — Report—Considered as amended— Third Reading—Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artizans and Labourers Dwellings) * [287], and *passed.*

Considered as amended — Third Reading — Norwich and Boston (Corrupt Voters) * [244]; Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland) * [286], and *passed.*

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation),* and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Winter Assizes (Ireland) (*re-comm.*) * [292].

The House met at Three of the clock.

POST OFFICE—TELEGRAPH MESSAGES.

QUESTION.

Dr. WARD asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is true, as stated in the Dublin papers, that very serious irregularities, amounting in some instances to practical failure, occurred in the transmission of telegraph press messages from Galway to Dublin on the occasion of the late Galway races; and, whether he can state to what these irregularities were due, and if he will direct an inquiry to be made into the circumstances?

Lord JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, that on the occasion of the late Galway races a great number of Press messages, amounting to 12,500 words, were handed in late at night for transmission from Galway to Dublin. No sufficient notice of such messages had been given, and they were not transmitted to Dublin without some delay. He believed, however, that, with one exception, the messages were all delivered in time for publication in Dublin.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—PUPIL TEACHERS.—QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether he has considered the desirability of affording facilities in our large towns for the grouping of schools so far as the education of pupil teachers is concerned; and, if so, whether he is prepared with that view to make any relaxation in the regulation in the new education code, which provides that a pupil teacher should receive his instruction in a single school?

VISCOUNT SANDON: Sir, as I mentioned in one of the discussions on education, the whole question of the pupil teachers is a very important one, and it is needless to say that we have considered the requests which have been made to us for an alteration in the system. No alteration in the Code can be made now to take effect before the new Code of next year. We shall further consider the subject during the interval, and shall be prepared to state our views respecting it when the discussions on the Code of next year come on. I wish it, however, to be clearly understood that I express no opinion whatever in favour of a change in the present system respecting pupil teachers under which the teachers of a school are responsible for the whole teaching and training of the pupil teachers who are under them.

NAVY—ROYAL MARINES—LIGHT INFANTRY.—QUESTION.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been called to the cases of the following officers in the Royal Marine Light Infantry, That (unless the long hoped-for scheme of promotion and retirement in this corps intervene) the senior Lieutenant-Colonel must compulsorily retire in March 1877 on a pension much less than such scheme would probably accord to him, or than he would have received had he served with similar rank and length of service in another corps; that (unless such scheme intervene) the Lieutenant-Colonel next in seniority must retire shortly afterwards through age, missing his next step by some four or five days, and consequently missing the higher rate of retiring allowance to which he would otherwise have been entitled; further, that a Captain in this corps has been permitted to accept an appointment which frees him from regimental duty for seven years, during which time he is marked on the roster as "not available for foreign service." That because this officer is not made a supernumerary (as would have been the case had he belonged to any other corps) the senior subaltern officer who has served seventeen years as such, is kept out of his hardly earned promotion; whether, considering the very long delay which has taken place in the publication of the report of the Royal Commission, he can give the House any assurance that the cases of these officers will be favourably and specially considered during the recess?

MR. HUNT, in reply, said, the Report of the Army Commission on Promotion and Retirement having been presented he should lose no time in submitting a scheme to the Treasury with regard to the Royal Marines. He was, however, unable at present to say how far such a scheme would affect the interests of the particular officers mentioned by his hon. Friend.

MUSEUM OF SCIENCE (SOUTH KENSINGTON).—QUESTION.

MR. E. J. REED asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, Whether it is true that a Memorial signed by many of the most eminent men of science in the Kingdom in favour of the establishment of a permanent Museum of Science, has been presented to the Lord President of the Council; if so, whether he has any objection to laying it upon the Table of the House; and, whether the Government propose to take any action in the matter?

VISCOUNT SANDON: Sir, I am glad the hon. Gentleman has called attention to the important Memorial to the Lord President of the Council, which has been signed by I may almost say all the most eminent men of science in the Kingdom, in favour of the establishment of a permanent Museum of Science at South Kensington. This is one of the many gratifying results of the remarkable exhibition of scientific apparatus which we have had the satisfaction of getting together at South Kensington, with the assistance of the leading men of science both of this country and of almost every civilized State. I will at once lay the Paper on the Table of the House. I am not in a position to say what action will be taken respecting it; but I need hardly assure the hon. Gentleman that it is receiving the best consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

CRIMINAL LAW—THE QUEEN *v.* CASTRO—THE TRIAL AT BAR—THE ORTON PORTRAITS AND PAINTINGS.

QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether there is any and what objection to return to Elizabeth Jury, a daughter of George Orton, certain oil paintings, viz., the portraits of her father and mother, which were lent by her for the use of the Court in the late Trial at Bar of the Tichborne Claimant, and as to which repeated applications had been made in vain to all the authorities concerned in the matter? He asked further, Whether the right hon. Gentleman still retains the opinion that the affidavits of this person, which prove unquestionably that there have been a miscarriage of justice, are not entitled to consideration?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he believed the portraits were taken possession of by the officer of the Court of Queen's Bench during the trial of the case of "The Queen *v.* Castro," and so far as he knew they were in the possession of that officer. He believed that neither the Treasury Solicitor, who had no objection to the return of the portraits, nor the Home Secretary, had any control over them. With regard to the last part of the Question, he could not add anything to the answer he had formerly given.

PHŒNIX PARK—DUBLIN—WHITEFIELD LODGE.—QUESTION.

Mr. BUTT asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it has been brought under the notice of the Lords of the Treasury that an offer has been accepted for the letting of Whitefield Lodge, a portion of the Phœnix Park, for a period of seventy-five years; and, whether the Lords of the Treasury will interfere to prevent such alienation of the property of the Crown being completed until this House has an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the subject?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, he had written to Ireland for information with regard to the proposal to let Whitefield Lodge, and he would undertake that no steps should be taken, except those to which the Government might be legally committed, without consultation with his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

Mr. BUTT said, he would repeat the Question on Monday.

NAVY—H.M.S. "THUNDERER."

QUESTION.

Mr. E. J. REED asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been drawn to an article in "Engineering" of August 4, stating that the steam gauge on the boiler that exploded in the "Thunderer" was known, before the explosion occurred, to be out of order; but that the engineers went on trusting to the gauges on the other boilers telling them what the pressure was in this one, and giving numerous facts and particulars respecting the explosion, into none of which has the Coroner yet instituted any inquiry; and, whether, considering that the repeated postponement of the official inquiry into all such facts and particulars, until they may be in part forgotten by the witnesses, and in part obscured by subsequent discussions in the Press, tends to defeat the objects of the inquest, he would inform the House if the executive Government or the Crown have the power to secure a prompt and full examination of those witnesses who were present at the explosion?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, in order to ensure that there shall be a perfectly impartial and full inquiry, with the consent of the Treasury I have placed at the disposal of the Coroner funds to provide for scientific witnesses with regard to the boilers, and also a legal assessor to assist him in the inquiry, making it the sole condition that the appointment should be vested entirely with him, and that the Government should have nothing whatever to do with it. I think I should be going out of my way if I interfered with the discretion of the Coroner, either as to the time of taking the inquiry or the calling of witnesses.

IRISH FISHERY INSPECTORS—GUNBOAT.—QUESTION.

Mr. M. BROOKS (for Captain Nolan) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If his attention has been called to the following statement contained in the lately presented Report of the Inspector of Irish Fisheries, page 6:—

> "Having frequently urged the great necessity of having attached to this department a suitable cutter or steamboat under our control, and stated at length the reasons why such would be most desirable, we consider it unnecessary to repeat the same arguments over again;
>
> "We therefore confine ourselves to saying that our usefulness would be much increased if we were provided with the means we have so often sought for to enable us to carry on the duties as efficiently as we would wish;"

and, if it is the intention of the Government to provide the Inspectors of Fisheries with the vessel which they have so often represented they stood so much in need of?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, my attention has been called to the statement quoted by the hon. Member from the Report of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, and to similar recommendations in previous Reports. I was not at first satisfied that sufficient necessity existed for devoting a vessel solely to this special service to warrant the expenditure that would be required. But the duties of the Inspectors have somewhat increased, owing to the work imposed on them by the Irish Reproductive Loan Fund Act, and in consequence I made inquiry whether the Admiralty could place a gunboat always at the disposal of the Inspectors. The Admiralty felt unable to comply with the suggestion, and I am now in communication with the Treasury on the subject, with the view of ascertaining whether, and to what extent, the Irish Fishery Inspectors could be placed in this matter in the same position as the Scotch Fishery Commissioners.

COAL MINES—THE CLIFTON HALL COLLIERY ACCIDENT.

QUESTION.

Mr. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been called to the confinement of 330 men and boys in the Clifton Hall Colliery, belonging to Andrew Knowles and Sons (Limited), carrying on collieries near Manchester; if that mine is in the district which is under the inspection of Mr. Joseph Dickinson; whether the colliery was being worked under the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act, which imposes the duty of having two shafts, one being for an escape shaft; if so, why the people were detained in the mine; and, if there has been a violation of the Mines Regulation Act, has he directed that the owners be prosecuted for having the said mine in a state calculated to endanger human life?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he was informed by the Inspector that the accident at the Clifton Hall Colliery was caused by the fact that the engine-driver, in a moment of forgetfulness, and contrary to the usual practice and the express rule of the colliery, started the driving engine before the signal to do so was given from above, the consequence being that the ascending buckets came in contact with those which were descending. No personal injury was caused, and as proceedings had been instituted against the person in fault the matter was not specially reported to the Secretary of State. He should, of course, see that the proceedings went on, and that proper steps would be taken to secure the punishment of the man who was responsible for the injury which had been done. There were two shafts in the mine, and the reason why the second shaft was not used to bring the men up was that the person in charge of the mine thought it would be much better to repair the shaft up which the men could go with absolute safety than to use one which would be attended with more risk. There had, he believed, been no contravention of the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act. If he found that there was, he should direct the necessary proceedings to be taken.

INLAND REVENUE — RAILWAY PASSENGER DUTY—THE LONDON, CHATHAM AND DOVER, AND THE LONDON, BRIGHTON, AND SOUTH COAST RAILWAYS.—QUESTION.

Mr. MACDONALD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he has any objection to lay upon the Table a Copy of all the Correspondence that passed in the year 1875, between the Board of Inland Revenue, the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, and the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company, in respect to the basis on which the South Eastern Railway was assessed for Railway Passenger Duty by the Inland Revenue Department, with all papers, reports, minutes, and orders relative thereto?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that it would be inconvenient to comply with the request contained in the Question of the hon. Gentleman.

LAW AND JUSTICE — THE QUEEN'S PROCTOR.—QUESTION.

Mr. HOPWOOD (for Mr. Torrens) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, What steps have been taken to fill up the office of Queen's Proctor, and whether in future the person discharging the duties of such office will be paid by salary and not by fees?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, the office of Queen's Proctor, rendered vacant by the sudden death of Mr. Hart Dyke, has been filled by the appointment of Mr. A. K. Stephenson, the Solicitor of the Treasury, under a Royal Warrant of 2nd August, in the terms of that by which the late Queen's Proctor was appointed. This appointment has been made *ad interim*, in order to allow time for considering the arrangements to be made for the future conduct of the office. A Committee of Inquiry has recently reported—"That it will not be desirable on the occurrence of a vacancy to appoint another Queen's Proctor as a separate officer"—and has proposed that the business should be transferred to the Department of the Solicitor of the Treasury. The Solicitor of the Treasury has therefore undertaken the duties of Queen's Proctor under the Royal Warrant for the next six months, or longer, if necessary, at the expiration of which time it is hoped that it will be practicable to make permanent arrangements for the future conduct of the business by the same or a different officer, as may be found to be most advantageous for the public service. In the meantime, the Treasury Solicitor will receive the fees hitherto received by the Queen's Proctor, and will account for the same to the Treasury. No determination can yet be come to as to whether the duties of the office will in future be paid by salary or by fees.

NAVY—H.M.S. "VANGUARD."

QUESTION.

Captain PIM asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, considering the success which has attended the efforts of many Naval Officers in rescuing their ships under circumstances of extreme difficulty, he will be prepared to afford any assistance in men and materials to any Naval Officer or Officers who may lay before him a well-considered plan for raising H.M.S. "Vanguard?"

Mr. HUNT: I cannot, Sir, recommend that course. We have had a great number of letters on the subject of raising the *Vanguard*, and a great many have proposed that the plans of the writer should be carried out at the expense of the Admiralty. We have not thought it right to adopt that method. Every negotiation for a contract for the raising of the *Vanguard* has fallen through, and we now propose to advertise for tenders for the selling of the ship. The advertisements will appear early next week.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

QUESTION.

Mr. DUNBAR asked the Secretary of State for War, What is the number of vacancies in the Army Medical Department; how many appointments were announced as open for competition at the competitive examination to be held this month; whether the time for entering candidates' names has not now expired;

and, how many candidates have entered their names?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, there were 27 vacancies in the Army Medical Department; 50 appointments had been announced as open for competition at the examination this month, and 44 candidates had entered their names.

VISIT OF H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES TO INDIA—THE EXPENDITURE.—QUESTION.

Mr. C. B. DENISON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he can inform the House whether accounts have been rendered of the expenditure of £60,000, granted in aid of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales's journey in India; and, whether any further Vote is likely to be asked for?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes, Sir, very full accounts have been sent in to me of the expenditure incurred by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales during his recent visit to India. I may say in passing that the way in which those accounts have been prepared reflects very great credit on Sir Bartle Frere, Colonel Ellis, and others who have been employed in the keeping of the accounts, and show that great economy was exercised throughout that expedition. The accounts have been very carefully audited by Sir William Anderson, and I have gone through them with him. There still remains a small number of outstanding bills to be provided for, but there is a sum of money unexpended more than sufficient to cover those bills. There certainly will be no occasion for any supplementary Vote. On the contrary, there will be a small surplus of, perhaps, a few hundred pounds left over when the accounts have been finally settled. I think I shall be only expressing the feeling of the House when I say that we ought not to ask His Royal Highness to repay that small surplus into the Exchequer. It may very fairly be left in the hands of His Royal Highness, considering that he expended his own money in the purchase of works of art and specimens of Indian manufacture which are being exhibited at the South Kensington Museum. I think, Sir, the whole account reflects great credit upon all concerned.

MIDLAND RAILWAY—THE RADSTOCK ACCIDENT—THE BLOCK SYSTEM.

QUESTION.

Mr. HAYTER asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, when completed, the report of Mr. Ravenhill upon the recent Railway accident at Radstock, in which twelve persons were killed and thirty wounded, on the Midland line, in order that the House may have an opportunity of judging of the block system, as applied to single lines?

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY: When the very serious accident occurred at Radstock—serious not only in its results, but in its special circumstances—fortunately, Captain Tyler was within reach, conducting an inquiry into the previous accident near Long Ashton, and he was on the spot where the accident happened within not many hours. I thought the case so serious that I ordered a special inquiry, which is now going on, and the Report will be laid before Parliament at the earliest opportunity.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL TAXATION (IRELAND)—VALUATION.

QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. Butt,

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, that the attention of the Government had been called to the evidence before the Committee on Local Taxation in Ireland on the injustice of the present system of valuation in Ireland. The Government were conscious of the serious irregularities in local taxation in Ireland, and would give the subject serious attention during the Recess. Owing, however, to the importance and difficulty of the subject, they could not come under any absolute engagement to bring in a Bill next Session.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read,

TURKEY—THE ALLEGED ATROCITIES IN BULGARIA.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY rose to call attention to the delay in obtaining official information as to the outrages in Bulgaria, and to the want of prompt and energetic action in the matter on the part of the Government and of Her Majesty's Representatives in Turkey. The hon. Gentleman said, that the third reading of a Bill which was to appropriate public money to the respective Services of the Crown appeared to him to be a fitting one, if it were not the only one he now had, for calling the attention of the House to matters in which he ventured humbly to think the character, if not the interests, of this country had been imperilled through the action of some of those Services. He would not apologize to the House for bringing the matter before them. If under the circumstances of the end of the Session, and the short time at the disposal of the House, any excuse was needed beyond the gravity of the questions involved, he would find ample excuse in the fact that last Monday evening, when the truth of these charges against the Turkish Government was on all sides acknowledged, and when to the Head of our Government was imputed, whether rightly or wrongly, an indifference to these events, and a desire to palliate, if not to conceal them, the Prime Minister maintained silence throughout the whole evening, and, as far as the right hon. Gentleman himself was concerned, he left Europe and England to imagine that he still adhered to his former attitude of sceptical apathy. The right hon. Gentleman ought to give him (Mr. Ashley) thanks, and not censure, for affording him an opportunity to repair his omission, though whether he received the right hon. Gentleman's thanks or censure—greatly as he preferred the former—would make no difference in the view he held, that it was incumbent on the Government to explain, if they could, where the blame lay, for the undoubted fact that within a district not three days' journey from the place where they were sitting, and under the auspices of a Government with whom we were in the closest alliance, there were perpetrated in the early part of the month of May murders, mutilations, rapes, and devastations, which the much-abused Huns and Vandals might have envied for their completeness, and yet that it was only in the first week in August that Her Majesty's Government seemed to be aware of the truth of the statements that had been made; and that even now, having read the Papers laid on the Table of the House that morning, he saw no adequate protest communicated to that Government the responsibility for whose acts this country was, by force of circumstances, compelled to share. ["No, no!"] Hon. Gentlemen might cry, "No, no!" but he held that we were morally responsible for these acts; and he would endeavour to show, before he sat down, that what he had said was supported by the facts of the case. No protest against these cruelties had been recorded worthy of the character or of the power of England. He was not going into renewed details of these atrocities, because he would rather leave those to the better skilled, and he believed the entirely truthful, pens of newspaper correspondents. But two remarks he wished first to make in answer to those who endeavoured to palliate these atrocities by saying that they were reprisals for the acts of others, and were the necessary concomitants of civil war. Both of those positions were untrue. By people inside as well as outside that House, the attitude of the Montenegrin soldiery was unconsciously confused with the attitude of the Bulgarian peasantry. He did not deny that the Montenegrin soldiery were brutal in war, though not so bad as formerly, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina also, he admitted the Rayahs were guilty of isolated acts of atrocity, and he did not justify them; but he maintained that the Bulgarian peasantry had never been guilty of organized cruelty, that they were an inoffensive people, who were perfectly unarmed, and were incapable of carrying on war. As to the second excuse, when the honour of women and the slavery of children became the prizes of war among civilized nations, then the atrocities which had been perpetrated in Bulgaria might be described as concomitants of civil war. We also had had atrocities, but these were confined to summary executions and wholesale destruction; but such as those to which he called attention never had been carried on by any civilized nation, and never should be. What he wanted to show on going through the Papers was, first of all, that the Turkish Government knew perfectly well the character of these Circassians whom they let loose on the unfortunate inhabitants of Bulgaria; that the English Government was also acquainted with their character, and that the English Government knew that the Turkish Government knew the character of these men, who were lawless, brutal, and licentious. In October last, 12 refugees returning to Herzegovina, were murdered by Bashi-Bazouk irregulars in the presence of the regular Turkish troops. The Grand Vizier, when his attention was called to this outrage by Sir Henry Elliot, promised that the perpetrators would be promptly punished; but time passed on, and nothing whatever was done to fulfil that promise. Was it right or wise, when the British Government had thus owned their responsibility, that they should have allowed the matter to drop without insisting upon redress being given? He referred to this transaction merely to show that the English Government were perfectly aware of the character of these Circassians. When they were first sent to Bulgaria no less a person than Midhat Pasha was Governor of Nish, who himself bore testimony that the Bulgarians were a peaceful and laborious people, who desired nothing more than the honour and safety of their families, and were willing to pay their taxes. And yet the Turkish Government, of which Midhat was one of the chiefs, who were perfectly well acquainted with the lawless character of the Bashi-Bazouks and Circassians, let them loose to work their will upon that defenceless population. He wished to submit a statement to the House which he had received from Constantinople, and he challenged the Government and Sir Henry Elliot to say whether it was true or false. It was to the following effect:—

> "1. Skefket Pasha, the commander of the troops who were sent from Adrianople to Slieven, himself gave orders to his troops and irregulars to ransack the city of Yamboli, four hours distant from Slieven. He also bombarded and destroyed entirely the village of Boyardjik, eight hours distant from Slieven, whose inhabitants did not take any part whatever in the insurrection. Skefket Pasha has been appointed General of the Imperial Guard of the Sultan's Palace.
>
> "2. Reschid Pasha, who destroyed the large and flourishing village of Peronshtizza, in the Province of Philippopolis, and massacred most of its inhabitants, was promoted and appointed Colonel of the troops stationed in Slieven.
>
> "3. Deli Nedjib Effendi, Governor of Plevna, who, with Bashi-Bazouks, destroyed about 1,000 houses in the district of Sevlievo, was rewarded with the decoration Medjidieh of the fifth class.
>
> "4. Tossoun Bey, from Karlovo, who destroyed the small town of Klisoura, in the Province of Philippopolis, and many other villages in the district of Gupsa, of the same Province, has been appointed Mudir (governor) of Karlovo.
>
> "5. Ali Pehlivan, the commander of a numerous band of Bashi-Bazouks, who perpetrated many atrocities in the Province of Philippopolis, was promoted to the rank of Bimbashi (Colonel), and was allowed to go at the head of 10,000 Bashi-Bazouks and fight in Servia.
>
> "6. Hafiz Pasha, under whose eyes and in whose presence the Bashi-Bazouks massacred about 600 people in the village of Batzigovo, in the Province of Philippopolis. Hafiz Pasha also kept for a week within his private apartments Rainoe, the Bulgarian schoolmistress of Otlonkeui, and violated her. Nothing has been done to him, and at this moment he is commander of a division of the army operating in Servia.
>
> "7. During the latter part of June 50 decorations of the Medjidieh class were sent to the Vali of Adrianople to be distributed among those 'qui se sont distingués en combattant l'insurrection bulgare.' Such were the phrases of the papers at Constantinople.
>
> "8. Aziz Pasha, who was Governor of Philippopolis at the time of the outbreak of the insurrection in that Province, and whose justice and philo-Bulgarianism are well known, was removed from office and recalled to Constantinople, where he is staying now. There is no doubt that had Aziz Pasha been maintained in his post things would not have reached such lamentable proportions. Likewise the Governors of Carlovo and Adjar (small towns in the Province of Philippopolis), who had shown some zeal in defending the Christians and opposing the lawlessness of the Bashi Bazouks, were dismissed from office and replaced."

Those statements he would, if agreeable, hand to the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs who could take the steps necessary to ascertain whether they were true. Some of them, he might observe, were corroborated by communications from our Consuls published in the Blue Book now on the Table, and the source from which the letter emanated led him to believe that all the statements it contained were well-founded. It should be remembered that during all the time these outrages were going on accounts of them were being published in the Constantinople newspapers, and the Government of Turkey had never contradicted them. What they did was this. They went to the newspaper offices and said—"Instead of publishing these distressing letters, send them to us, and we will lay them before the Grand Vizier, who will deal with the matter." The papers of Constantinople, however, continued to publish the letters, not having that confidence in the Turkish Government which some people appeared to think ought to be reposed in them. There could be no doubt that our Government was not sufficiently supplied with information as to these occurrences. He desired to speak of Her Majesty's agents in Turkey with the greatest possible kindness, more especially as they were not present to defend themselves, but they showed incapacity to deal with the circumstances in which they were placed. The Consul at Adrianople, M. Dupuis, was a sufferer from chronic paralysis, and was physically incapable of acting with that energy which the circumstances demanded, and he blamed those in authority, who, either knowing, or who ought to have known, the position of that gentleman, did not remove him to some other place and appoint another person more capable of discharging the duty. The Turkish Government were now endeavouring to make out that there was a great and organized insurrection in Bulgaria, and that they were driven into a corner and obliged to make use of any means at their disposal for its suppression. They thus excused themselves for the employment of the Circassians; but that was very different from the language which they held at first when they spoke merely of some slight troubles in Bulgaria, which they expected speedily to come to an end. He (Mr. Ashley) was prepared to admit that there was an insurrectionary movement in the month of May, but those engaged in it never exceeded 1,000 men, most of them being refugees or Servian emissaries. [The hon. Gentleman then read a number of extracts for the purpose of showing that the outbreak in Bulgaria was not of such a nature as to require the Turkish Government to employ irregular troops in addition to their Regular forces.] He did not want to read more than was necessary from these Papers, but in a despatch from Sir Henry Elliot to Lord Derby, shortly after the change of Government in Constantinople, Sir Henry wrote that he would not fail to point out the danger—danger, he (Mr. Ashley) supposed to the Turkish Government—of organizing those expeditions of Circassians and Bashi-Bazouks, who were committing the most atrocious outrages on humanity and civilization. But they did not know whether Sir Henry Elliot had done more than this. Consul Dupuis, when he informed Sir Henry Elliot of the irregular bands of Bashi-Bazouks and Circassians who were enrolled by the Turkish Government, said as to their proceedings he had "no means of ascertaining them." What was a Consul sent to a district for, but to find out such means? As to others of our officials, they had a certain amount of information, but did not act with energy, and grave responsibility rested on their superiors for not insisting upon their gaining more complete information. At page 267 of the printed Papers there was a despatch from Sir Henry Elliot to Lord Derby, in which he stated that he might "accept the assurance that the accounts as to the Bulgarian outrages had been exaggerated to a degree which must deprive them of the slightest credit." And this notwithstanding the Report of Mr. Baring, which had since appeared. And now as to our Home Government. He confessed he was always unwilling to make any remarks on men in a high position in that House. He felt that young Members should avoid doing so; but what encouragement was given to a Consul who, finding himself in a situation of great difficulty, sent home official despatches which were treated by the Prime Minister as "mere coffee-house babble?" Consul Reade said he was inclined to think the object of these lawless bands was to diminish the number of Bulgarians—if he had said "educated" Bulgarians he would have been right; for there was an evident determination to diminish the intelligent and educated majority of the Bulgarians—and all this with the perfect connivance of the authorities. The unarmed population was absolutely at the mercy of these savages. It was said the emergency was so great as to render it indispensable to put down the insurrection by any means immediately available. But the extermination of a peaceful people was not justifiable in any circumstances, and it was to be regretted that Sir Henry Elliot did not at once tell the Turkish Government that the extermination of this population for the purpose of re-adjusting the balance between Christians and Mahomedans was not justifiable under any circumstances, but, instead of doing that, Sir Henry Elliot adopted the view that the Turkish Government had no choice under the circumstances but to employ the Circassians and Bashi-Bazouks. Lord Derby wrote to Sir Henry Elliot on the 13th of

July. The language of that despatch was good, very good; but this he must point out—he could find in these Papers no instance in which Lord Derby had written to Sir Henry Elliot a despatch instructing him to read it to the Turkish Minister and leave him a copy. He did not pretend to any great diplomatic experience, but he had always been taught that when any serious remonstrance was intended, that was the first step. Not once had Lord Derby written such a despatch, strongly saying that the outrages which had been perpetrated were a disgrace to the Turkish Government and to humanity; that they would not be tolerated by civilized Europe. Nor had Lord Derby sent for the Turkish Ambassador in this country and said—"I am now speaking to you in the name of the Cabinet. I tell you the acts of your Government are a disgrace to humanity, and what you are doing will receive no countenance from us. I ask you to put that in writing and send it to your Government." But they had nothing of the kind. They had no interview with the Sultan demanded by the English Ambassador. They had only unreported conversations of Sir Henry Elliot with the Vizier, the force and character of which they did not know, but only the result, which was *nil*. He remembered Lord Palmerston writing to a representative of this country abroad—"You are quite right to report home whatever is said to you, but you are quite wrong to adopt as your own all the nonsense which it may contain;" but Sir Henry Elliot did adopt as his own the statement that the Porte was obliged to employ the Bashi-Bazouks. There was abundant proof that the Porte had Regular soldiers to spare if they were required in Bulgaria, there being 5,000 present at the time, and Sir Henry Elliot abandoned his proper judicial position in expressing a contrary opinion. A paragraph in one despatch (Page 372) showed how Consuls were indoctrinated with the belief that they were to put things in a favourable light for the Porte, for Consul Dupuis, unable to report a better state of things, said if he were compelled to notice the disorders committed, it was not from any desire to say anything adverse to the Turks. He could not help thinking that the difficulty of our Government had partly been—and so far he sympathized with them—that our Consuls acted under the belief that they were not to say more than they could help about the shortcomings of the Turkish Government. With reference to newspaper correspondence he said that there were hon. Gentlemen in that House who talked in a way that showed that they forgot what a great advance had been made in the way of "our own correspondence" since the pre-Crimean days. The newspaper correspondent under the present state of things was not an ill-educated partizan, but a cultivated traveller, and in nine cases out of ten was without prejudice. His only prejudice was that in favour of telling the truth as largely and successfully as he could. Did they suppose that the newspaper correspondents, many of whom they in that House personally knew, had any desire to back up the Bulgarians against the Turks, or the Turks against the Bulgarians? They were cosmopolitan to the largest extent; they were men who had seen the world, and who could form mature judgments, and he might say that the information received by the newspaper Press in this country was rapidly supplanting the information which the Foreign Office could command. A noble Lord opposite had demurred to the suggestion of the responsibility of our Government for the action of the Turks. On that point he must appeal to the universal opinion of the Turks themselves. He had received letters from American missionaries in Turkey during the last week, telling him that the Turks considered they were being backed up by England. He did not feel called upon to say whether or no in his opinion the Government were right in refusing to sign the Berlin Memorandum; but they should certainly have made counter-proposals, and the despatch of May 19, in which Lord Derby announced that refusal to the Turkish Government was remarkable for its omissions. One would have expected Lord Derby to say—"Do not let us be misunderstood. We are not prepared to say that you ought not to give guarantees, or that you have not broken your pledges. All we have done is to say we will not join in this minatory action on the part of the Northern Powers, for reasons of our own; but do not imagine that we are going to back you up in whatever you may do. We know you are engaging

Circassians and Bashi-Bazouks. Do not think we shall help you in any difficulties you may get into on that score." It was incumbent on the Government to have said something to that effect, but Lord Derby only wrote—

> "Her Majesty's Government cannot conceal from themselves that the gravity of the situation has arisen in a great measure from the weakness and apathy of the Porte in dealing with the insurrection in its earlier stages," and "from the want of confidence in Turkish statesmanship and power of government."

How could the Turks understand that, except as a direct warning that they must make shorter work of Bulgaria than they had of Bosnia and the Herzegovina? Again, could it be supposed that the despatch of the Fleet to Besika Bay had no effect upon the Turks? There was at the time great uncertainty as to the cause of the proceeding, but they had since heard from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that the Fleet merely went to protect British subjects who were in danger at Constantinople. But at first a very different impression prevailed. He was reminded of a story about one of the Kings of Prussia, who, on being told that abusive articles were being written against him, said—"Oh, never mind! I and my subjects have come to a compromise. I am to do what I like, and they are to say what they like." He could not help thinking that in this matter the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, had come to a compromise by which the Secretary of State was to be allowed to do what he liked, and the right hon. Gentleman to say what he liked. At any rate, until the Papers were laid on the Table, and the deputation went to Lord Derby at the Foreign Office, there was a notion that the Fleet had been sent to Besika Bay to meet some threatened attack upon Constantinople. The arrival of our Fleet must have produced a great effect upon the Turks, and if we had led them to believe that we should encourage them in dealing sharply with the insurgent Provinces, what became of our non-intervention? He should doubtless be asked what the Government ought to have done? It would be dangerous for a private Member of that House to answer a question of that sort, for unanswerable objections could always be

stated by the organ of the Foreign Office to any plans that might be suggested, and therefore he would only say that our Government ought to have managed to let the Turkish Government know that they were in earnest. He would only give as an illustration of a statesman in earnest, a proposal made to the British Cabinet during the Greek War of Independence. It was in Lord Palmerston's own words (*Bulwer's Life*, p. 293)—

> "When accounts came that the Turkish fleet had carried away Greeks as slaves, I called the attention of the Cabinet to this circumstance, and urged that it would be a stain on our national character if we did not make an effort to recover them. The Duke of Wellington received the proposition coldly; Aberdeen treated the matter as a thing we had no right to interfere with. Bathurst—as the exercise of a legitimate right on the part of the Turks—and Ellenborough as rather a laudable action. They said—What do you propose we should do? I said, we have some hold over the Pasha by the presence of Ibrahim and his army in the Morea. Let the Pasha know that till the whole of the slaves are given up that army will be starved in pawn."

Sir Henry Bulwer wrote to Lord Palmerston from Constantinople, in July, 1838, and forcibly conveyed to him that the influence of England would be less in proportion to the services she might render to Turkey, than in proportion to the dread she was able to inspire. He (Mr. Ashley) concurred in that statement, and thought that if the British Government wished to show a due sense of the atrocities that had been committed, they should make so strong a representation to the Turkish Government as to show that they were in earnest, and they ought to recall Sir Henry Elliot from Constantinople on the ground that the Foreign Office had not been properly informed of what was going on, and that he had not been able to control the Turkish Government. He wished now to say a few words as to the future. This was an important moment, when the Recess was coming on and the House would not meet again for six months. He was in favour of a spirited foreign policy, but the spirit he wished to pervade our policy was a spirit of freedom on behalf of oppressed nationalities. The influence of England had always in the long run been exercised in that direction. This was not a question as between Mahomedanism and Christianity; but it was a question of a ruling army encamped on a soil upon which had grown up new nationalities, which had made strides in education and refinement, that had made the yoke burdensome which had before been lightly borne. Much had been said of the integrity of Turkey. He trusted that the time would never come when the integrity of Turkey would be regarded not as the means to an end, but as the end itself. Many persons looked upon the integrity of Turkey as a golden calf to be worshipped, and not as a means to an end—that end being to prevent any other Power from obtaining a dangerous preponderance in the East. The time was, however, rapidly approaching when there would be many other means to that end. Let the House remember how completely the aspect of Europe had changed since the Crimean War. Germany had become a great Power. Italy had become united. Austria had become far stronger because she had no Italy to curb, and her Provinces were more reconciled to each other. There were thus three Powers—where there were none before—to curb the ambition of Russia. The condition of Russia had also entirely changed, for she had now a peaceable Emperor, and the country was not anxious for war. The Crimean War was as much caused by the refusal of the Porte backed up by England to surrender the Hungarian refugees to the Emperor Nicholas as by the question of the Holy Places. Russia had now ceased to assume her former aggressive attitude, and it was desirable to seize the present moment. Another Emperor might succeed to the throne animated by different feelings, and England ought to be ready to co-operate with Russia or any other Powers in order that these Provinces should as early and as peaceably as possible receive an autonomy and a Government of their own, subject only to the Porte as their suzerain to whom they should also pay a tribute. This Turkish policy of sitting upon the safety valve might be worthy of the captain of a Mississippi steamer, but not of a civilized State. The ruling Turk had not, in fact, changed since the time when the streets of Alexandria were strewn with the books of the Alexandria library, and when the Caliph Omar exclaimed—"If these books are in favour of the Koran they are unnecessary, and if they are contrary to the Koran they are mischievous, and so burn them all." The Turk had not changed in his views from that day to this. He was not speaking of some half dozen Europeanized Turks at Constantinople, but of the nation at large. The ordinary Turk was a grave, honest man, but he was as benighted as ever he was. The Bulgarian population, on the other hand, had during the last 20 years made enormous strides. Schools had been established in almost every village, and it was the jealousy of this on the part of the Turk which had been the cause of half the atrocities that had been committed, and which had been directed principally against the priests and schoolmasters. England was strong enough to do what was right and just, and if Russia was to be fought, let us fight her openly, and not over the prostrate bodies of these Bulgarians. In the *Life of Lord Palmerston* he found that in 1848 he remarked that the real policy of England was to be the champion of justice and of right. She was, of course, Lord Palmerston said, to act with moderation and prudence, and not to be the Quixote of the world; but she ought to give the weight of her moral sanction and support wherever she thought justice was, and whenever she thought wrong had been done, and in such a case she would never find herself altogether alone. It was a narrow and false policy, Lord Palmerston added, to suppose that this country or that was to be marked out as the eternal ally or perpetual enemy of England. She had no eternal ally, and no perpetual enemy. There were, however, people, in 1876, who thought that Turkey was to be our eternal ally, and Russia our perpetual enemy. Lord Palmerston went on to say our interests alone were eternal and perpetual, and that every British Minister should make the interest of England the shibboleth of his policy. He (Mr. Ashley) contended that the interests of England were not concerned in sacrificing justice and right to the mythical notion of keeping the Russian Fleet out of the Mediterranean, where we could meet her on equal terms, in alienating from England the feelings of these nascent peoples and throwing them into the arms of Russia, or in checking the development of new free States. He could not think that the Government were really opposed to the emancipation of these subject-races; but he would remind hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Conservative Party were kept out of office for many years by their ill-disguised hostility to Italian emancipation. ["No, no!"] Well, if an objection was raised, he would not say their hostility, but their lukewarmness. He ventured to say that if the country thought that Her Majesty's Government or the Party which followed them were really indifferent to the aspiration of these subject-races in Turkey, the same feeling would be excited, and they would suffer from the same cause.

Mr. FORSYTH said, that although he could not think that his hon. Friend the Member for Poole (Mr. Ashley) had made out a case which would justify the House in censuring the Government and its diplomatic representatives in Turkey—he rejoiced that an opportunity had been given to the House before the Session closed of expressing their horror at the outrages which had occurred in Bulgaria. They could now offer to Bulgaria nothing but barren sympathy; but with respect to Servia, against which country the fortune of war seemed to be turning, the debate might be attended with good results. The Servians might be unable to resist the Turks in the open field and the contest would assume the character of a guerilla warfare, in which the Bashi-Bazouks and other irregular troops would find opportunities for perpetrating the atrocities which had occurred in Bulgaria. Lord Derby, writing on the 9th of August, only two days ago, to Sir Henry Elliot, said—

> "It appears to Her Majesty's Government that the capture of Saitschar may probably lead to the occupation of a considerable part of Servia by Turkish forces.
>
> "I have therefore to instruct your Excellency to urge strongly on the Porte that it is absolutely necessary that its troops should be kept under proper control; that the unarmed population should be spared; and that any repetition of the outrages committed in Bulgaria should be avoided.
>
> "Your Excellency will point out that any renewal of such outrages would prove more disastrous to the Porte than the loss of a battle. The indignation of Europe would become uncontrollable, and interference in a sense hostile to Turkey would inevitably follow."

He (Mr. Forsyth) felt sure that these words would find an echo in the heart of every Englishman. Now the object of the speech of his hon. Friend was to censure the Foreign Secretary and Sir Henry Elliot, and he would take the two cases separately. First, with respect to Lord Derby. There ought, he submitted, to be evidence before them to show that the noble Lord did not act with promptitude and energy on the information before him before they could pass such a Resolution. He thought he could demonstrate that not a shadow of a shade of blame attached to Lord Derby throughout the whole of these transactions. Lord Derby was here in England, and could only act upon the information before him. He could not act upon mere rumour or report, and, on the information he received, he did act with promptitude and energy. The insurrection broke out at the end of April, but the first intimation of any disturbance in Bulgaria which reached Lord Derby was received in a despatch dated May 4, and it contained these words—"Some disturbances have taken place in Philippopolis." In a despatch of the 7th of May that statement was repeated; and the first allusion Lord Derby made to the subject was to be found in his letter of the 25th of May, in which he said—

> "Her Majesty's Government approve the communication which your Excellency intends to make to the Turkish Government upon the subject of the recent outbreak in Bulgaria."

Writing on the 20th of May, Consul Reade informed Lord Derby that "the rising of the Bulgarians is all but put down;" and he received no further communication on the subject until the 9th of June, when Consul Reade wrote to say—"I have heard nothing particular to report." Up to that time that was all the information Lord Derby had. From a despatch dated the 18th of June, received 10 days later, he first heard of the Circassians and Bashi-Bazouks being brought into Bulgaria. Well, the day before the substance of what had appeared in *The Daily News* was brought before both Houses of Parliament, and on the 26th Lord Derby wrote to Sir Henry Elliot, urging him to make inquiries and furnish information, and enclosing the newspaper reports, as he did also, in a later letter, those which subsequently appeared. The next despatch was from Sir Henry Elliot, who enclosed two despatches from Vice Consul Dupuis on the subject of the outrages. Sir Henry Elliot said that the excesses were unquestionably very great; but that there had been monstrous exaggeration; that cases of revolting cruelty had been mentioned to him which turned out on investigation to be fictitious; and adding that, while atrocities had been committed, the Christians commenced them, although the Turks were the greatest offenders. So that even then Lord Derby was told that great doubt was thrown upon Vice Consul Dupuis' Report, and informed that some things that were stated were known to be false. Lord Derby, however, on the 14th of July wrote to Sir Henry Elliot directing him to bring the Reports of the Vice Consul under the notice of the Porte, and to urge strongly that orders should be given to the local authorities without loss of time to repress the outrages and punish those concerned in them, and that a proclamation should be issued to put a stop, under severe penalties, to the sale of women and children, and directing the release of all persons improperly detained in custody, and that those released should be protected. What, he asked, could Lord Derby at that time have done more? No hon. Member of the House—no matter how strong might be his desire to put down the commission of outrages—could have written in a stronger or more determined manner than Lord Derby did. On the 19th of July Lord Derby again wrote to Sir Henry Elliot, approving what he had done in the way of addressing remonstrances to the Porte with reference to these atrocities. The first Report made by Mr. Baring in relation to the matter bore date July 25, but was not received until the 4th of August. It stated that he had visited the villages, and, as far as he could gather about 12,000 Bulgarians had perished; the number of Turks killed being, in his opinion, short of 1,000, many of whose deaths had been attended with circumstances of great cruelty. On the 8th of August Lord Derby again wrote to Sir Henry Elliot in strong, emphatic, and indignant terms, instructing him to make further representations to the Porte in reference to the atrocities, and stating that he could not speak too strongly of the horror which the statements received had aroused in the minds of the Government and the people of this country. Sir Henry Elliot was also instructed to report further as the progress of the insurrection and the incidents connected with it. This was the whole of the Correspondence by means of which the House was able to judge whether Lord Derby had or had not been guilty of remissness or neglect in reference to the subject of the atrocities; and he contended that as far as Lord Derby was concerned, and as far as his means of procuring information enabled him to act, he lost no single moment of time, but acted with energy and decision. If that were so, there was no basis for the first part of his hon. Friend's speech, which called upon the House to censure the conduct of Lord Derby. He felt bound to admit, with regard to Sir Henry Elliot, that he did not seem to have been sufficiently alive to the gravity of the circumstances in which he had to act. It must be remembered, however, that at the time engrossing and momentous events were happening in Constantinople, where Sir Henry Elliot was. First, there was the massacre at Salonica, then there was the deposition of the Sultan Abdul Aziz; and, in the next place, there came the assassination of several Turkish Ministers. In addition to all this, there was the fact the Porte constantly denied the truth of the statements made in relation to the outrages alleged to have been committed; but, at the same time, he must admit that there was a certain absence of energy and a disposition to believe the Turkish statements as against those made by Christians which somewhat surprised him. An examination of the different statements made must convince anyone that gross exaggeration was indulged in on both sides, although it was clear to his mind that the outrages of the Turks outweighed those of the Christians a hundred-fold. Yes! there were atrocities on both sides, and it might be said—"Are you to ignore the atrocities of the Bulgarians, and to heap all your wrath upon the Turks?" This, however, was not the way to put the question. The point of view from which he regarded it was this—Her Majesty's Government was not dealing with a host of savages, but with a Government in friendly alliance with England, and possessing a Regular Army sufficiently strong to repress excesses indulged in by its irregular forces. It was different with the insurgents, who had been downtrodden for centuries, and had perhaps become brutalized by oppression, so that they so far forgot themselves as in some instances to give way to feelings of revenge. This country had a right to call the Turkish Government to a severe account for what had occurred, and it was no sufficient answer for the Porteto say that atrocities had been committed on the other side. If a Government was too weak, or was unwilling to repress these atrocities, it was not fit to be a Government — certainly not a Government to which the moral support of England ought to be extended. The hon. and learned Member then proceeded to quote from the Correspondence, which contained many most distressing details, in order to show that the balance of atrocities committed by the Turks was far heavier as compared with those committed by the Bulgarians. The Turkish Government had sent out a Commissioner with extraordinary powers, but he (Mr. Forsyth) did not believe the Report. The challenge was as to particular localities and circumstances, but the Commissioner dealt only in vague generalities. He (the Commissioner) did, indeed, say that there was a document which contained the plan of the details of the insurrection, and which stated that the men and women of Mussulmans were to be murdered; and that this document had appended to it the names of a number of persons concerned. All important, however, as it was to the Turkish Government, this document had never seen the light; and, therefore, its existence could hardly be believed in. No doubt there had been individual atrocities on the part of the insurgents, but nothing like what there had been on the other side; and it was admitted that Bashi-Bazouks and Circassians had been let loose on these people "to diminish their numbers"—that was, to murder them. Sir Henry Elliot, to whom Midhat Pacha had denied the outrages, said that he wished that it were possible to accept the denial; but the testimony as to the outrages committed upon Bulgarian women and children was too strong to be disbelieved. There was also the statement of a gentleman who had travelled from Schumla in company with a high Ottoman functionary, and who on his way asked the police if they had profited by the rising to diminish the number of Bulgarians, and he added that he feared that they had not done everything in their power and everything that they ought to have done in this direction.

After that who could wonder that atrocities had been committed by the irregular troops? Moreover, the fact had been overlooked that after the insurrection was over, and the prisoners were about to be examined, judicial torture was resorted to by the Turkish authorities for the purpose of extracting confessions and procuring condemnation. The question now was as regarded the future. Could we, as a Christian nation and a free people, continue to give a moral countenance and support to a nation whose Government had allowed the horrors of which they had just heard to be perpetrated, unchecked and unreproved until England had at length sternly remonstrated with her? It seemed that if we did so we should be creating for ourselves a totally false position in England as regarded the grounds upon which we gave our support to Turkey at all. We had stood by Turkey longer than any other nation had done. We had been her friend and we had put faith in her promises for the reform of her Government, which she had broken over and over again. Under these circumstances, we should let the Turkish Government know that as the price of our friendship and our alliance for the future there must be a total change in their attitude towards the Christian population which was subject to them. Turkey had much to repent of in the past, and Servia was now before her, where the same cruelties would be perpetrated if the voice of England did not make itself heard in stern and unmistakeable tones. Servia, perhaps, might not be able to meet Turkey in the open field, but, nevertheless, she would be able to carry on a protracted guerilla warfare, and would not be eventually conquered. Thus a long and desultory conflict would ensue, in which many atrocities might occur if steps were not taken to prevent them. If the war continued for any length of time the feelings of the Slav populations of Russia and Austria would become so excited that they would force the hands of those Governments, who would be compelled to go to war in defence of Servia, and would not allow her to be conquered. And he did not believe that England would allow a shot to be fired or a shilling to be expended by herself in defence of Turkey to prevent that interference. The sooner, therefore, Her Majesty's Government began to propose mediation for the purpose of stopping the advance of Turkey into Servia the better it would be for the peace of Europe. In his opinion the best thing that could happen for Turkey would be that her Christian provinces, which under the present system formed a gangrened limb, should be entirely separated from her and formed into free and independent States, which would act as a barrier between herself and the rest of Europe.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER thought every one must agree that the House could hardly have separated without some further allusion to the subject which his hon. Friend the Member for Poole (Mr. Evelyn Ashley) had brought under their notice. The eloquent remarks with which his hon. Friend had concluded his speech would alone afford a justification for the Notice which he had given. He (Mr. Forster) candidly admitted that if he had put a Motion on the Paper he did not think that he should have expressed it in terms which would make it appear to have been framed to convey a positive censure on the Government, and for this reason—that this was a matter of such immense importance, deeply concerning the honour and credit of the country, and especially as regarded the future action of Government, that they should, if possible, come to a nearly unanimous conclusion with regard to the policy they would suggest to Her Majesty's Government, and to their expression of the feeling of the country. He therefore deprecated any spirit of Party feeling being excited by the fact of any direct attack being made upon the Government. But his hon. Friend had not put his Notice in the form of a Motion. At the same time, what he had said with regard to the past, and what the hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. Forsyth) had stated in reply to him, seemed to make it impossible that the past could be entirely overlooked, and doubtless Her Majesty's Government themselves would desire an opportunity of giving additional explanations in reference to it. It was, for instance, rather an astonishing fact that when terrible deeds had been perpetrated on such an extensive scale as recalled to memory the atrocities of ancient times or the Middle Ages, within a few days' journey of London, the particulars of which had been in the knowledge of the newspaper correspondents for the last six weeks, Her Majesty's Government should not have received reliable information with regard to them until a very few days ago. This was in itself a fact that required explanation, and he could not help thinking that if the Government had to live over this time again they would take care that they did obtain information more quickly, and act upon it more quickly than they did. The House would recollect that it was on the 26th June that he ventured to ask the Prime Minister as to a statement that appeared in *The Daily News*. It was the first statement respecting these atrocities, and it had been wonderfully borne out by what now proved to be the facts. The Correspondent did not pretend to give exact figures, admitting that the dreadful atrocities committed had a tendency to exaggerate themselves. He did not vouch for numbers, but he stated that from 13,000 to 18,000 had been killed; and in his second letter he put the number at 12,000, which was what the official investigator imagined it to be. The Correspondent said 100 villages were believed to have been burnt, though he did not vouch for the number, and he gave many details, mentioning one terrible story of burning, which he did not give as a fact, but which he hoped might not be true. The right hon. Gentleman was glad the other day to find that this was a falsehood; but, on looking at the papers this morning, he (Mr. Forster) was sorry to see that the way in which that atrocity was denied did not appear to him to disprove the fact. There were other occurrences not quite so glaring, but almost as bad, of the truth of which there could be no doubt. The reply of the Prime Minister was that it was true that the war was carried on between the invaders and the Bashi-Bazouks and Circassians with great ferocity, but the information which had been received certainly did not justify the statements which had appeared in the newspapers. Thus it appeared that Ministers were entirely in the dark with regard to the truth or falsehood of those statements. The hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Forsyth) said Lord Derby did not lose a moment in ascertaining the truth. He could hardly think that was quite correct. He could not for a moment suppose that

Lord Derby, in his intense anxiety about Eastern Affairs, had not himself read those accounts on June 23. He should have thought that, without waiting for any Question being asked of him, he would have telegraphed at once to Constantinople to ask whether the horrible story was true, especially as he did not think they ought to have been exceedingly surprised, seeing that they had information of the employment of irregular troops, whose character was known to them. Beyond that, they had in their hands a despatch of Sir Henry Elliot, dated June 8, in which he said that the Bulgarian insurrection appeared to have been put down, though he regretted to say with cruelty, and in some places with brutality. Knowing what these irregular troops were he was surprised that no telegram was sent, and much more surprised that when Lord Derby had assured the Duke of Argyll that further inquiries would be immediately made, these inquiries were not made by telegraph. He should have thought, if the telegraph was of any use, it would have been used on that occasion. The Government sent no telegram; the newspapers did, and when he again interrogated the Government they had no information, whereas *The Daily News* had received a longer list of atrocities and more detailed information, and similar information appeared in *The Times*, showing that in all probability the stories were now true, and creating a great change in public opinion in England. This was so marked that one journal, *The Daily Telegraph*, which had said when the first letter appeared in *The Daily News* that it was utterly impossible the news could be true, and that "these villages did not even exist," no longer attempted to deny the general truth of the story. The Government were more ignorant than anybody else. They had no information, and made no attempt to get it. He confessed if they had realized the meaning of the report and the responsibility of this country in the matter they would have set more eagerly to work to get the information upon which to base protests of misrepresentation. At the same time, he admitted the Government had been misled by Sir Henry Elliot. He had been informed of the statements in *The Daily News.* They had constantly been brought before him, as he happened to know, by persons in Constantinople whose representations he ought not to have dismissed as unworthy of credit. Sir Henry ought to be called upon to explain why he treated as unworthy of credit statements brought to him in this way and which afterwards turned out to be substantially correct. Then coming to the position of the Prime Minister on July 10th. There was no answer to the Question then asked him, though he had the information contained in Consul Reade's despatch of June 16th. That was in the hands of the Government, and it stated that it was an object with the Turks to diminish the Bulgarians as much as possible. He was surprised at the answer of the Prime Minister on July 10th in the face of that despatch.

Mr. DISRAELI: Perhaps I may be allowed to explain that I had not seen that despatch. From circumstances which I can in private explain to the right hon. Gentleman, but which would weary the House, I had not received that despatch.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he was very glad indeed to have that explanation. They all knew how busy the Prime Minister must be, and that, although a despatch had reached the Foreign Office, he had not seen it. Sir Henry Elliot, who did not appear to have realized what had occurred so near his own house, seemed to have turned a deaf ear to representations made to him concerning the atrocities, and to have lent an ear freely to any sort of apology for the Constantinople Government. As to his despatch of July 25th it appeared to him (Mr. Forster) that *The Daily News* correspondence was as well worthy of credit as the extract from *The Levant Herald;* and it was surprising that in the same despatch, while he spoke of the credulity of *The Daily News* as being imposed on, he did not mention Consul Reade's despatch containing the news of the promotion of the man who had been concerned in the atrocities. He must have also received the despatch of Vice Consul Dupuis from Adrianople, which said—

> "Judicial torture, as your Excellency is aware, is a common practice in connection with judicial proceedings now going on against Bulgarian political prisoners,"

and he must have received the telegram from Philippopolis, at which the number of killed were stated at "below 15,000."

With that telegram in his possession he sent a despatch describing correspondence as sensational the statements in which did not go beyond his own information. On the 6th of July Sir Henry Elliot said that without an agent on the spot he was unable to say more than that there were atrocities, chiefly committed by the Turks. Feeling his want of information, it was astonishing he did not send some one to the spot until he was directed to do so by the Government. Mr. Baring, in the letter he had sent from Therapia, said he had great difficulty in obtaining information; and no wonder, considering that he did not speak Bulgarian, and the dragoman could not, and the accompanying Consul could not, and the Bulgarians were in constant fear of the Turks. The natural consequence of leaving this inquiry to persons ignorant of the Bulgarian language would be that a Report favourable to the Turks would be received with suspicion and mistrust. He could not understand why at the later stages also more use had not been made of the telegraph wires. The last information in the official Papers was a telegram of the 30th July, but *The Daily News* had telegraphic information from Philippopolis of all that had passed. He could not understand why the Government could not have had something like the same information. They could hardly have been deterred by considerations of expense. There were three questions to be fairly considered in connection with this matter; first, what did this terrible story mean? how far had we anything to do with it? and what lessons were to be learned from it to guide us in future action? The story, he thought, meant more than mere atrocity and devastation. It threw a light on the government of these Christian Provinces. The Prime Minister had evidently heard something about the relation of the Bulgarians and the Circassians, and he told the House the story of the Circassians fighting for their independence in the Caucasus and becoming voluntary exiles and settlers in Bulgaria at a time when there was general sympathy with them. Well, he (Mr. Forster) did not mean to enter upon any reproach of these men. He remembered when this country did feel great sympathy with the Circassians fighting for their freedom against the Russians, and their subsequent story, as he would tell it, was this. They left their country with a natural hatred of the Christians, and he wished the hospitality which the Turks extended to them had been extended to them at their own expense. Great care was taken not to send the Circassians to Turkish villages. They were given land without payment. In many cases, as he learned on authority that would satisfy the Government, Bulgarians were made to build houses for them, and had either not received more than half the payment promised, or no payment at all. The Circassians were naturally looked upon as intruders; they would not settle in the country, and in a few years they sold their interest in the land, and had been living the lives of gentlemanly brigands ever since. This constant brigandage had, of course, brought about ill-feeling, and then came last autumn the first beginning of any kind of insurrection. Up to that time there had been the usual government of Christians by Turks, and that there was misgovernment there was no attempt on the part of the Turkish Government to deny. In Bulgaria it was worse in some respects than in Bosnia and Herzegovina, because the people in Bulgaria were peaceful and inoffensive, and could be more successfully tyrannized over and oppressed than those of Bosnia and Herzegovina. When the insurrection in these Provinces was going on, it occurred to a very few in Bulgaria that they would have an insurrection too, and there was not a man in this country who would not have felt, under the circumstances, an enormous temptation to insurrection. Some few young men rose; somebody made it their business to inform the Turkish Government; they were arrested, and there was an end to the disturbance in October last year. But an excuse was made to put a large number of persons in prison, and the Turkish population was to some extent empowered to keep order. We know what was meant by the Turks keeping order amongst the Bulgarians. *The Stamboul* in November and December last year recorded terrible acts of brigandage, murder, robbery, dishonoured women, with the connivance of the authorities, and there was no attempt by the Turkish Government to deny these acts. Could it be wondered that there were some few Bulgarians in a state of revolt? A slight insurrection was met by fire and sword all through the country, and by the destruction of 10,000 or 15,000 lives. It was the greatest puzzle to him how so many could be killed, till from inquiries he received what he believed to be the explanation—namely, that before the 5,000 Regular troops had been sent, an army of Bashi-Bazouks and other irregulars, numbering, he was told, 18,000, were employed. The result was that the inhabitants of the Christian villages were in an intense state of alarm, and no wonder; they sent to the authorities, asking—"Are you going to protect us?" and the answer was, they must protect themselves. Of course they set to work to do so; the men from the smaller villages went to the large ones, and then the Bashi-Bazouks came down upon them. The worst part of the matter was that the Regular troops, instead of stopping these atrocities, assisted in the work of destruction. He held in his hand a letter from a Bulgarian merchant in Constantinople—a respectable man, who was anything but hostile to the Turkish Government. He gave story after story of outrages committed by the troops themselves, and the terrible tortures practised upon the poor people to make them accuse the priests and schoolmasters, the men whom they most respected. He did not believe there had been any attempt on the part of the Turkish Government to punish the perpetrators of these atrocities, and there would have been nothing but praise for them, but for the representations made on the part of the Christian Governments. It was a strong accusation to be made even by an independent Member against any Government, and especially against one with which we were in alliance; but he could not resist the conclusion that there was a positive intention on the part of the Turkish Government to strike terror into these Bulgarians, so that their troops might the more easily put down the insurrection. He would say nothing about religion; but this was a case in which the ruling minority were allowed to carry arms, while the large majority of the population were not permitted to carry arms for their protection. A minority in that state of affairs would always make a terrible misuse of their arms, and it was hopeless to expect good government in those distant Provinces where a small minority of Mussulmans governed a large majority of Christians. The sooner the House of Commons and the Government took that fact into its consideration the better, and it pointed to some sort of local authority. They were told that Russia was in favour of such a change, and that everything supported by Russia was opposed to the interests of England. Now, he very much doubted whether there was any ground for all this jealousy of Russia. There was no other possible future for these Provinces, and if we took up a position antagonistic to Russia we might find that we had lost all our influence in this part of Europe. Then came the question what were we to do under the circumstances? It might be said that these were not the only atrocities in the world. There were atrocities lately committed in Spain, but we did not interfere, and it might be asked why we were anxious to interfere in Turkey. He would say in answer that the reason was that we had interfered. In one of the first letters *The Daily News* gave an extract from a Turkish paper stating that—

> "England will protect us from Russia, and leave us to take care of our rebels ourselves;" and again—"England will protect us from the interference of foreigners, and leave us to deal with our rebels as we can."

Undoubtedly that had been the effect of our policy. It might not have been necessary to concur in the Berlin Note, but it was the continuation of an attempt on the part of the Three Powers to interfere for the protection of the Christian subjects of Turkey. He did not blame the Turkish Government for believing that the nation which protected her by money and soldiers 20 years ago would be as ready to do it again, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave some countenance to this belief when he was asked whether England would interfere. He said that she would not, but that she expected no one else to interfere. He did not blame the Government for taking this view, but the necessary consequence was that Turkey believed she would have the protection of this country against interference, and therefore we incurred a certain responsibility, and were bound to see what was done in her Provinces. When Lord Derby said he could not guarantee Turkey against suicide or disease, but only against murder, he ought to have added that he could not guarantee her against the penalty of murder, and it was that penalty she was now incurring. With the part we had taken the only course we could pursue was to show Turkey that no sense of our own interests and no jealousy of other Governments would induce us to sanction these atrocities. He did not know any other way of expressing that determination except by withdrawing our Minister from a country where our diplomacy seemed to have so little effect. As long as England was giving the impression to all Europe that she was the friend of Turkey, she was bound to see that this Power, the life of which we had prolonged, did not commit these atrocities. It was constantly said by many both in and out of Parliament that this country ought to have no sympathy with the Servians, that there never was a war so unprovoked, and so little to be justified, and that it proceeded from Russian intrigue and Servian ambition. He was not going to gauge the depths of Russian intrigue, but with a country governed like Turkey, and with Provinces so badly treated and so oppressed for centuries, there, if there were any neighbouring Power which had selfish motives, that Power would have the greatest means and opportunity of intrigue. The Emperor of Russia was himself the greatest friend of peace, but there might have been instigations to insurrection from private individuals in Russia or even from Government officials. But why were such instigations dangerous? Because of the materials they had to work upon, and if Englishmen were in the place of these people they would need no intrigues to press them on to revolt. He did not know what might be the personal ambition of the Prince of Servia, but they had now to think of the Servian people. They had made a declaration of war, but it should be remembered that the grandfathers of the present Servians were the slaves of the Turks. There was not a family in Servia in which stories of atrocities committed by Turks were not handed down from father to son, and when these people found men of the same race near them subjected to outrages by the Turkish troops could the House be surprised at the sympathy they exhibited? There was not an Englishman in their position who would not do the same. It was, therefore, unreasonable to charge the Servians with having begun an unprovoked war when it sprang from the natural and in some respects the most honourable feelings of humanity. They had made a mistake; they did not understand the state of diplomacy—few could. They might have repented this grave attempt, but it was not for us to complain of them. Could we not remember our own feeling in the case of Italy? Piedmont had even less chance of driving the Austrians out of Italy, but she manifested a sympathy with her Italian brethren which won the admiration and sympathy of the English people. But the two things would not bear a comparison for a moment. The government of Italy by the Austrians could not be compared with the government of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the Turks. Her Majesty's Government had thought fit to somewhat isolate itself and take a somewhat independent course. That independent course might be fully justified, but he did not think that as yet there was much on which the country could congratulate itself. The Government sent a war fleet to a war position, and they were told that the object in view was to protect the Christians. It seemed almost a mockery now to use those words. But having taken that ground, the Government could certainly step forward and propose a policy to the other Great Powers. They should at once take the opportunity of saying to the other Great Powers—"Let us together try and stop this war. Turkey has driven the invader out of her territory; let us prevent vengeance following defeat; and let us see, too, whether we cannot propose a scheme of mediation, and propose a plan by which to prevent a recurrence of these events." He was glad to conclude by expressing his hearty concurrence in one of those despatches—the last sent by Lord Derby.

> "Your Excellency will point out that any recurrence of such outrages," meaning the possibility of a renewal of them in Servia, "will prove more disastrous to the Porte than the loss of a battle. The indignation of Europe would become uncontrollable, and interference in a sense hostile to Turkey would inevitably follow."

He hoped that that despatch would find its way to the Sultan, if he were able to comprehend it, and that the Prime Minister as well as the Foreign Secretary fully understood what he (Mr. Forster) understood to be its meaning—namely, that if the Bashi-Bazouks and irregular troops, which they were told were the advanced corps of the Turkish Army, committed any approach to the atrocities in Servia which they committed in Bulgaria, the indignation of Europe, the indignation of England, would become uncontrollable, and that if this were a bordering country we would march our troops in to prevent such outrages. He hoped that that was the meaning of the despatch, and he hoped, too, that if Austria and Russia, or any other Government, finding such atrocities being committed, marched in their troops and interfered, there should be no opposition to such a course on the part of the Government. The honour and interests of England were in the hands of the Government, and they were now considering this matter with full information before them. Perhaps the Prime Minister, when he made one or two remarks in reference to it on a former occasion, found it necessary to guard himself against what he thought a premature opinion, but he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that he would have the support of hundreds of thousands of his fellow - subjects in this policy—"We shall take care of our own interests, and with respect to Constantinople we shall have our fleet to take care of those interests; but we cannot consent to this one thing. We cannot suffer ourselves to be implicated in the support of a Government which carries on war in this way, or attempts to put down its rebel subjects by a recourse to these inhuman atrocities."

MR. BOURKE said, the House would not expect him to follow the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Forster) through all he had said in reference to Servia, though much of it was germane to the subject immediately under discussion, All he would say about Servia was this — that he hoped she would not lose any of those dearly-bought liberties which she had purchased at so great a price some time ago. And whatever might be the fate of the war she had doubtless embarked upon, the condition of the Christian population of that country could never be a subject of indifference to Her Majesty's Government. He confessed that the question immediately before the House was one difficult to approach with any degree of calmness. He was glad to see that hon. Gentlemen opposite who had spoken in the debate did not pretend to arrogate to themselves exclusive sympathy for the sufferers by the acts which had occurred, and the difficulty which anybody must feel in dealing with this important subject was that all classes of the community, without distinction of class or Party, felt exactly the same sentiments of horror as were described by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. They must, however, recollect that in dealing with political subjects, although they might have feelings of horror in reference to these outrages, and, he believed, unprecedented acts of barbarity, yet, considering that the interests of this country ought to be first in the minds of Her Majesty's Government, they ought not to allow those acts of atrocity altogether to blind them to those interests or to the political considerations connected with them. He must say that his own feelings upon the subject had been considerably intensified by the opening observations of his hon. Friend the Member for Poole (Mr. Evelyn Ashley.) His hon. Friend began by stating broadly that he held Her Majesty's Government responsible for the outrageous acts which had occurred in Bulgaria. He must say he was startled with that expression of opinion, and, knowing that his hon. Friend had been brought up in the same Profession to which he had himself the honour to belong, he was anxious to see how his hon. Friend would prove his case; and he must say that a more impotent conclusion never was arrived at after a sweeping assertion of that sort. His hon. Friend based the whole of his charge of complicity on the part of Her Majesty's Government with those outrages upon two circumstances—the withholding of their assent to the Berlin Memorandum and the sending of the British Fleet to Besika Bay; and he endeavoured to support his case by reading part of a despatch which had nothing to do with the massacres—a despatch written upon a different subject and at a different time—in which Lord Derby warned the Turkish Government that instead of treating the insurrection in Bosnia with apathy, they ought to be more energetic. Therefore, said his hon. Friend, it was plainly shown that it was the wish of our Government that the Turk should carry fire and sword to all Christian populations. A more unfair assertion, he must say, he never heard, because if his hon. Friend had turned to the despatches which related to the outrages in Bulgaria, he would find the greatest horror expressed and the most peremptory directions given to Sir Henry Elliot to bring these occurrences to the notice of the Porte. The argument, therefore, as to the Berlin Memorandum altogether fell to the ground. With regard to the sending of the Fleet to Besika Bay his right hon. Friend at the head of the Government on a former occasion gave the House the reasons for that step, and proved that the sending of the Fleet there was consistent with the ancient policy which it was the bounden duty of Her Majesty's Government to adopt, that so long as we were a great Mediterranean Power, so long as we expected to hold India, so long as the commerce of England found its way to the distant East over the Mediterranean, the Power, Christian or Turk, who ruled the Eastern portions of Europe might vitally affect the destinies of England. Although that was undoubtedly true, his right hon. Friend stated that the proximate cause of sending the Fleet to Besika Bay was the consternation which prevailed among the Christian population of Constantinople and throughout Eastern Europe with regard to the intention of the Mussulmans. The immediate cause, therefore, of the sending of the Fleet to Besika Bay was the protection of the Christians, not only in Constantinople, but in all parts of the Levant; and yet his hon. Friend said that that course gave encouragement to the Turks and was followed by the massacre of a Christian population. Then, again, the Fleet was not sent to Besika Bay until the massacres had taken place in Bulgaria. But he was surprised that, after making that sweeping assertion, his hon. Friend did not inform the Government what they ought to have done, and all the more that his hon. Friend had had all his life particular opportunities of studying the foreign policy of England. He (Mr. Bourke) did expect that after denouncing the acts and policy of Her Majesty's Government, his hon. Friend would at least have intimated what, in his opinion, they ought to have done. On that subject his hon. Friend was entirely silent, except so far as to say he had no advice to give, and therefore he thought he might conclude they had not been very far amiss even in the opinion of his hon. Friend. He was not sorry that the question had been brought before the House, because he thought it would have been undesirable if hon. Members had separated, and in the country had addressed their constituents in the same tone and with the same arguments which had been used by some hon. Gentlemen who had spoken in the course of the present debate, without hearing the true facts of the case. He was not going to waste the time of the House by inquiring whether the occurrences to which attention was called had or had not been exaggerated. When the question was first brought forward, his right hon. Friend the Prime Minister stated his belief that there had been great atrocities, a statement that had been fully borne out by information which had been received since. It was sufficient to know that atrocities had occurred to such an extent as to justify all the indignation that had been felt in the country regarding it; and if he said anything that could be perverted into showing that he wished to paliate or excuse these shocking deeds, he could assure the House that he did it merely for the sake of narrative and statement, and in order that the House should have before it the facts of the case as fully as possible, rather than to show that he had any opinion whatever in favour of the Turkish Government in reference to this business. In the course of these discussions hon. Gentlemen had spoken with some degree of contempt of the newspaper correspondents. It was very difficult to please such hon. Gentlemen, because, if official documents were quoted, it was said that they were all prejudiced, that the stamp of red tape was distinctly marked upon them, and that they were all written with official bias. If, on the other hand, the letters of newspaper correspondents were quoted, it was said that they were unreliable rubbish, unless they happened to fit in with the preconceived opinions of hon. Gentlemen. At any rate, some of the statements made by a special commissioner of *The Levant Herald* were so important that they should be laid before the House and the country, merely remarking that the gentleman is question seemed, *primâ facie*, to be in just as good a position to give an historical account of what had occurred as any of those other most respectable correspondents—one or two of whom were friends of his own—who represented the London newspapers at the seat of war. From statements in that paper it appeared that in the month of February there were disturbances on both sides of the Balkan, but there was no real insurrection till April or May. What they were now discussing was the outbreak in May. In February emissaries appeared on both sides of the Balkan who put forth such demands against the Porte as could not have been complied with except by a renunciation of Sovereign rights. Complications also occurred in Servia and Montenegro, and the greater part of the Bulgarian troops had been ordered to the Servian frontier. Some of the statements which had been made were borne out by other authorities which had been brought under their notice. Disturbances broke out on May 4 at Adrianople and various places, and all communication between Adrianople and Philippopolis was for a time prevented, and it was stated that these cities were to have been burnt, and that a general insurrection was to break out before the middle of the month. It was also stated that special agents had been appointed to set fire to various parts of the town on the same day, and, in order to gain access into Turkish quarters, Bulgarians entered the service of Turkish families in the capacity of grooms. Philippopolis and Adrianople were to have been set on fire in a great number of places. Mussulmans offering any resistance, policemen, and soldiers, suspicious officials, as well as refractory Christians, with their wives and children, were to be killed without mercy.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT wished to know whether this extract of *The Levant Herald* was given on the strength of the Government?

Mr. BOURKE said, he felt bound to give those statements because not only had statements been made in that House from the Opposition benches, but anonymous statements had also been made. Letters had been read from gentlemen in Turkey, and even from friends of gentlemen in Turkey, of whom Her Majesty's Government had no knowledge or means of knowing who they were, and he thought the statements he had just read to the House, which he would not vouch the truth of, were at all events equally worthy of credit with those that were contained in such communications, which had been after all the foundation of the question being brought before the House. No doubt the Circassians had played a very prominent part in this terrible drama, and he should like the House and the country to know who these Circassians were. In a Paper presented to this House in 1864, which threw a great deal of light upon the subject, containing correspondence relating to the immigration of the Circassian tribes into Turkey, with an account of the circumstances under which they had been driven out by the Russians, and of the preparations which had been made to receive them in Turkey, Consul Stevens, in a despatch to Earl Russell dated Trebizond, February 17, 1864, said—

> "The agglomeration of Circassian emigrants in this town has become a serious matter, and ought to occupy the immediate attention of the Porte. During the last three days fresh arrivals have taken place, and circa 3,000 have been landed; some 40,000 more were preparing to quit their country. Among those who have reached, hundreds are labouring under disease, superinduced by famine and misery which they suffered previous to embarkation."

Sir Henry Bulwer, in speaking of this emigration in a despatch dated April 12, 1864, said—

> "Twenty-five thousand have already reached Trebizond, and others are endeavouring to escape in small boats at every risk. The conglomeration of vast quantities of these people, who have no industrial habits, threatens the health and peace of any one locality, and the loss of life which is occasioned by their hazardous attempts to escape from their conquerors is shocking to humanity. The Turkish Government is therefore about sending vessels to Trebizond to remove the emigrants thence, and place them in different parts of the Empire."

Consul Dickson, on the 13th of April, 1864, said—

> "The Ubikh and Fighett tribes are fast embarking for Trebizond. In fact, after their land having been laid waste by fire and sword, emigration to Turkey is the only alternative allowed to those mountaineers who refuse to transfer themselves to the Kouban steppes and contribute periodically to the militia. The condition of these poor people is described by eye-witnesses as most distressing. In the hurry of departure the overcrowding of boats is so little heeded as to lead to frequent disasters, while such of their horses and cattle as war and famine have spared are sold for a few paper roubles. In some instances the emigrants, sooner than see their weapons (may be heir-looms in the family for centuries) exchange hands with the enemy have flung them into the sea."

Sir Henry Bulwer, in another despatch from Constantinople, dated the 3rd of May in the same year, said—

> "The Ottoman Government is willing to afford the refuge they desire. But its means for doing this are, as your Lordship knows, scanty. What it has already done—and this, comparatively speaking, is little—has been at a cost of £200,000. One mode of granting hospitality to these unhappy exiles is by dividing them among different Turkish villages in different districts, and alloting to four Turkish families one Circassian family in these districts. This is undoubtedly the cheapest mode, but the worst. It adds to the miseries of the already miserable condition of the Turkish peasant; it affords but a wretched chance of existence to the poor Circassians; while the strength of these almost invincible warriors is divided, dissipated, and lost. It would be a matter of policy, favourable both to Turkey and Europe, to colonize that part of the Ottoman Dominions which extends from the Black Sea towards Erzeroom with these gallant fugitives. This country is opposite to that they have quitted, and in some degree resembles it; and here they might repose from their misfortunes. For carrying out a plan of this kind, however, in a suitable manner the Turkish revenue affords no adequate means—that revenue is already appropriated—nor would it do, just as Turkish credit is beginning to move a little freely, to overburthen it by taking from the ordinary income of this country a sum which that income cannot without great embarrassment supply. At the same time the sum in question would not be so great if reduced to annual income. The calculation I make is about £1,500,000 sterling; the employment of a part of the Circassian population on the Erzeroom road and in the Turkish Army might make it something less. Take the interest at less than £100,000 per annum. Still, it would hardly be fitting for Turkey to seem to beg for this sum, however great the necessity for it, and however noble and useful the purpose on which it is to be employed. There should be something like a movement in Europe to aid her. Surely policy, humanity, public admiration for unexampled valour, public pity for almost unexampled distress, would come in to assist a cause to which no heart that has ever felt for deeds of patriotic heroism could be insensible. I think I know your Lordship's sentiments sufficiently to flatter myself that they will not be very different from my own; and if they should eventually be embodied in any scheme somewhat like that I have hastily sketched out, it will be a source of the highest gratification to me to have contributed in the slightest degree to have called forth a tribute of generous feeling towards a nation which, from a variety of untoward circumstances, has been crushed amid the universal regret of sympathizing Europe."

When it was considered that 12 years ago these Circassians had been treated like wild beasts, it was not so very surprising that when they had the opportunity, and found their old enemy at their doors, that they should act like savage animals? The House must also recollect what was the state of things when the Bulgarian insurrection first broke out. He need not remind the House of the Salonica massacres, of the action of the Softas, and the deposition of the Sultan, and the general state of confusion which existed when the news arrived of the outbreak, in which a great number of persons had lost their lives. Sir Henry Elliot, writing on that occasion, described what had taken place, and from that time he never lost an opportunity of impressing upon the Turkish authorities the necessity of avoiding acts of cruelty and of not employing the Circassians and the Bashi-Bazouks in the suppression of the outbreak. Although some of the despatches from Sir Henry Elliot had been read already, he would, with the permission of the House, allude to them again very shortly because he wished to bring under one focus the different representations which had been made by Sir Henry Elliot. On the 23rd of May, 1876, Mr. Sandison wrote to Sir Henry Elliot as follows:—

> "In accordance with your Excellency's instruction, I strongly represented to Raschid Pasha the injudicious employment of Bashi-Bazouks in Bulgaria, for which the Porte alone was responsible. His Excellency stated in reply that Vizirial orders were sent yesterday directing the authorities in Bulgaria not to resort to the services of Circassians as irregulars. I thought proper to tell his Excellency that this was doing away with one class of Bashi-Bazouks only, and that there were just as strong grounds for giving similar orders in regard to the common Bashi-Bazouks, who were equally brutal and licentious. His Excellency did not seem to think, however, that the matter rested any longer with the Porte, now that Abdul Kerim Pasha, the Generalissimo, was entrusted with the sole direction of everything connected with the military operations in Bulgaria."

On the 19th of June, 1876, Sir Henry Elliot wrote to the Earl of Derby—

> "I have again spoken very seriously to the Grand Vizier on the subject, and remarked that the manner in which his colleagues had just been murdered by a Circassian gave an idea of what must be the position of unarmed populations left absolutely at the mercy of hordes of those savages."

On the 6th of July Sir Henry Elliot wrote—

> "Abdi Pasha, the ex-Minister of Police, has been appointed to command the Bashi-Bazouks enrolled to operate against Montenegro, and has already left for Antivari. Although an old man, he is active and energetic, and, from

> what I have heard of him, I hope he may be able to exercise a salutary authority over the wild mountaineers under his orders. I have strongly recommended that an energetic commander should be appointed over the irregulars to be employed in Servia, and I have pointed out to the Turks that if the progress of their troops in that Principality is marked by barbarities upon an unresisting population, the indignation throughout Europe may become so great that the Government may be driven by the force of public opinion to step in to put a stop to them."

And on the same day he wrote—

> "For weeks past I have never seen one of the Turkish Ministers without insisting upon the necessity of at once putting an end to these excesses, and their answer has been invariably the same."

That language of Sir Henry Elliot was entirely approved by Lord Derby, and he did not think that any stronger language could have been employed. Hon. Members appeared to imagine that our Ministers in foreign countries were in a position to send an armed force to any part of the country in which they were, whereas all that they could do was to use strong language in order to express their own views and those of their Government. At the time when Her Majesty's Government were receiving those despatches, their attention was drawn to the subject by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Forster), and they were thoroughly under the conviction that everything that could be said had been urged by Sir Henry Elliot, and that the employment of the Bashi-Bazouks and of the Circassians in the suppression of the outbreak would be at once discontinued. But they sent Sir Henry Elliot the articles in the newspaper. The language used a few days since by Lord Derby, which had met with the approval of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and which was used after the noble Lord had had the advantage of hearing what was the public opinion on the subject, and all the discussions which had occurred in that House, was almost identical with that which had been originally used by Sir Henry Elliot, to whom, therefore, exactly the same praise was due as the right hon. Gentleman had bestowed upon the noble Lord. Again, Sir Henry Elliot occupied himself in attending to the question of disarming these Circassians. On the 14th July he again wrote that he had continued his inquiries, but that he had not been able to verify the statements which had been made as to the wholesale slaughter which was said to have taken place. He (Mr. Bourke) would not go over the three despatches which had been written by his noble Friend the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, because the course which he had taken had not been attacked, though the course of Sir Henry Elliot had been attacked by several of the speakers. He could not himself see what Sir Henry Elliot could otherwise have done short of either withdrawing from the Embassy or sending for force. The sending for force was out of the question, and the withdrawing from the Embassy would have been a disastrous thing at that period, considering the great events which were occurring at the time. It would be seen from the Papers that Sir Henry Elliot was not the only Ambassador who was in the same position with regard to information upon this subject, for up to the end of June his Russian and Austrian—or certainly his Austrian—Colleague knew nothing about these Bulgarian atrocities. To say, therefore, that Sir Henry Elliot had not shown due diligence in ascertaining facts was manifestly unjust; and he might add that it would be an evil day for England if public servants were to be attacked without great circumspection, and upon the fullest evidence. Of course, he did not mean for a moment to maintain that the conduct of public servants ought not to be criticized; but it was necessary to bear in mind that the Papers which had been laid before the House went over a lengthened period, and that Sir Henry Elliot had throughout been subjected to a great amount of mental strain and anxiety, and had acquitted himself in a way which was satisfactory to Her Majesty's Government. The hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Ashley) had said they should recall Sir Henry Elliot, but the recall of the British Ambassador without full and adequate inquiry—for that was practically what was demanded—would, he did not hesitate to say, be a most unfortunate event, not only in regard to the particular position which Sir Henry Elliot occupied, but in its effect on the public service of the country generally; for unless public servants were treated with justice it would be impossible to obtain good men for high and responsible positions. The hon.

Member had further said that the present question had nothing to do with the relations existing between Christians and Mussulmans; but he could hardly understand that assertion. So far as his (Mr. Bourke's) observation went, the root of the difficulty lay in that very matter. The relations of Christians and Mussulmans lay at the bottom of everything connected with the question, and unless that fact was recognized, it would be impossible to make any satisfactory arrangement. As to the question of autonomy, he would remind the House that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), in the speech he recently delivered in the House on Turkish affairs, dwelt particularly on the necessity of maintaining the territorial integrity of the Turkish Empire; and it was not very easy to see what hon. Gentlemen meant by "autonomy," and he believed that there were not two statesmen alive who would agree what that word meant in practice. Perhaps they might make a scheme founded upon such a principle, but it would require discussion and compromise of existing opinions respecting the meaning of the word "autonomy." The right hon. Member (Mr. Forster) had spoken of the future. Well, with reference to the future the Government, as the House was aware, had appointed a Vice Consul at Philippopolis, to whom special duties were to be assigned, and of course they would regard it as their duty during the Recess to watch events with the greatest circumspection. He felt bound to admit frankly that the Government really had no idea of the events which had occurred in Bulgaria, until attention was called to them in the House; and he gladly took the opportunity of saying that the Government and the country were very much indebted to the newspaper correspondents through whom those events had become known. ["Hear, hear!"] Hon. Gentlemen said "Hear, hear!" but he hoped he had never used language which could be construed as implying anything to the contrary, and he was quite sure the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had never done so. Upon the first intimation of the atrocities, the duty of the Government was to ascertain what had actually occurred, and having done that, they acknowledged most fully and freely the services of those gentlemen. Into the question of mediation he did not think it desirable to enter at any length, because it was a subject which concerned not England alone, but all the great Powers. He would merely remark in regard to it that if there was one thing more than another in which Europe was interested it was the maintenance of the territorial *status quo*, and he only hoped it would apply to Servia as well as to the other parts of the Turkish Empire. In addition to what he had said with regard to the future he might state in view of the events which had occurred in Bulgaria, and the possibility of similar events occurring in Servia, although the circumstances there were different, the Government had appointed a general officer of great distinction to accompany the Turkish Army into Servia. The officer in question was Sir Arnold Kemball, whose qualifications for the duty no one could doubt. He was acquainted with the seat of war and knew the Turkish language, and no man, he was sure, would more strongly vindicate the cause of humanity than he. He might also remind the House that this officer was then at Constantinople, and he had been employed in Turkey for some time. With regard to this appointment, a telegram had just been received from Sir Henry Elliot in the following terms:—

> "Porte makes no objection to military *attaché* proceeding to Head Quarters, and Sir Arnold Kemball is willing to go. He will require a few days to make preparations."

He hoped that he had now gone through the principal points which had been raised in the course of the discussion. He did not think that the conduct of Sir Henry Elliot had been successfully impugned, but he was quite certain that the respect that he had for the House would induce him to pay the most serious attention to what had taken place. He (Mr. Bourke) hoped also that the Government would not be turned away from the great question with regard to our Eastern policy which was now before them, and dreadful as these occurrences were, he believed that they ought to take care that they were not thrown off their balance, or made forgetful of contingencies of still greater moment to this country.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, that he desired to take that opportunity of making some general observations on the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, and of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of it, and that he should then address himself to the question more immediately before the House. There was a feeling entertained by a very large class of people out-of-doors that the Government at home and abroad was doing a great deal that was tending to weaken the position of the House of Commons in the country, and to deteriorate the Constitution.

MR. SPEAKER: I am bound to call the attention of the hon. Gentleman to the question before the House. It is the third reading of the Appropriation Bill, and any observations that may be made must be relevant to that Bill.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE rose to Order. It would be of great interest, in reference to future discussions on the Appropriation Bill, if hon. Members knew what was the exact rule on the subject. Last year there was on the Appropriation Bill a long discussion about the Fenian prisoners; and on looking back, he found that discussions on almost every kind of subject had been held in years gone by on the third reading of the Appropriation Bill. If any general rule could be laid down it would be very convenient.

MR. SPEAKER: The rule of the House is that in the discussion on the Appropriation Bill any observations applying to one of the clauses in the Bill may be made. No doubt the clauses in the Appropriation Bill have a large application; but I cannot understand how the observations of the hon. Member can be regarded as relevant to any clauses in the Appropriation Bill.

MR. E. JENKINS said, in deference to the ruling of the Speaker, he should not unnecessarily pursue his argument; but he would ask whether it was not relevant to some clause in the Appropriation Bill that he should call attention to the fact that Her Majesty's Ministers, who did receive some remuneration, were not discharging their duty in a manner which the country might expect from them.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member proposes to call in question the salaries of a Minister or Ministers of the Crown, no doubt he would then be in Order.

MR. E. JENKINS said, that under the Speaker's ruling he was unable to see the relevancy to the Bill of the discussion that had taken place as to the foreign policy of the Government. He had proposed simply to make some remarks on the domestic policy of the Government; but as he was precluded from referring to various points which had been raised during the Session, and in which the character and conduct of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government were open to criticism, he would come to the matter immediately before the House. The conduct of Her Majesty's Government with regard to foreign affairs had been of the most unsettled character, and with regard to that, at all events, the right hon. Gentleman had been open to grave censure. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had spoken in honied words, and had thrown out inuendoes, but did not say definitely whether the Government had or had not done that which was wrong. He (Mr. Jenkins) was prepared to support the hon. Gentleman who had brought the matter before the House (Mr. Ashley) to the full extent to which he went in his Notice. What was the position occupied with reference to the question at that moment? They had a series of surprises, and they had at one time heard one thing said by a Member of the Government, and another thing by another Member of the Government. He instanced the various and conflicting statements made by Ministers with regard to the purchase of the Suez Canal shares. Then they had found some discrepancy existing between the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister with reference to the Fleet sent to Besika Bay. This sort of thing was far more serious than anything that could occur with regard to our domestic policy, because it would be known through the whole of Europe. He considered it a most disgraceful thing, in a country like this, that there should be things said by one Minister and denied by another. It was at one time the roaring of a lion, and at another the roaring of Bottom the weaver. Some protests at all events should be made against the action of the Government, and he knew from careful reading of the provincial Press that there was growing up in the country a strong feeling that they were being shamed in the face of Europe by the conduct of the Government. There was a discrepancy between Members of the Government with regard to the Bulgarian atrocities, and not only that, but the light and flippant style in which the Prime Minister had answered Questions had created great indignation in the House. Then when they had waited on the Earl of Derby with regard to the Bulgarian outrages, they had failed to get from him that expression of horror at the atrocities which ought to have been made. The Under Secretary, however, had spoken as he always did on such subjects, but his vicarious tears came too late. It would have been better if they had been dropped at an earlier stage of the proceedings, and that the hon. Gentleman had been allowed to get up in his place and state the horror he felt at the atrocities when they had only just commenced. He (Mr. Jenkins) would further refer to the traditional policy of this country in regard to Turkey, and he maintained that by the Treaty of Paris of 1856 Turkey having been admitted into the European system, which was a humane system, was bound to carry on war in at least a humane, if not a Christian manner. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had spoken of the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire as a thing which it was necessary, or, at all events, important, for this country to support, while at the same time he pointed out that the autonomy which that right hon. Gentleman wished to secure for the disaffected Provinces of Turkey would render her territorial integrity a mere shadow. Ha held that by the Treaty of 1856 we were not bound to guarantee the territorial integrity of Turkey. One thing should not be lost sight of—that Lord Palmerston said the Treaty was only intended to last for 14 or 15 years; and his sagacity was proved by the event. He maintained that we were not now bound by the Treaty to guarantee the integrity of Turkey. The engagements entered into by the Three Powers at Berlin and Vienna were inconsistent with the Treaty, which was thereby broken in spirit, if not in fact. At all events, there were no moral grounds for insisting upon the Treaty of Paris, or for maintaining the guarantee. Why was it, he asked, that we found Austria, Germany, and Russia concerting together to prepare a note, without taking other nations into their councils? It was the jealousy believed to be entertained by England against Russia. Now, though circumstances had changed since then, he thought that the principle formerly laid down by Mr. Cobden still held good, and that there could be no danger to a great commercial country from the increase of a Christian nation and the spread of civilization over the world. He hoped that the Government were trying to disabuse the mind of Russia, that we looked upon her with jealousy, or that we did not believe her when she denied any intention of territorial aggrandizement in the direction of Turkey. Then it was no longer the duty of England to maintain "the balance of power," a fiction which was exploded at Solferino, at Sadowa, and at Sedan. Could we be bound by any undertaking to stand up for a State which allowed such atrocities? In a document attached to the Treaty of Paris, Turkey had solemnly promised to observe the rights of Christians, but not one of the terms of this undertaking had been kept. There was an unlimited amount of evidence as to the violation of pledges, the succession of outrages, and the corruption perpetrated by the Turks in some of the fairest lands on the globe. That being so, he held that it was a ridiculous idea, that because we had 45,000,000 of Mahomedan subjects in India we were bound to be careful what we did with respect to Turkey. What he desired to see was autonomy in the Turkish Provinces. He did not care what autonomy it was — whether it was Grecian, Roumanian, Bulgarian, Bosnian, or Herzegovinian. It would be more consistent with good policy, he contended, that we should endeavour to join with Russia in inducing Turkey to grant a system of autonomy, and so to put an end to the distressing and disgraceful atrocities in question, and the state of things which now existed in Turkey, rather than that events should be allowed to take their course, and that eventually the Russian people, no longer able to control their sympathies, should throw themselves into Turkey and cause greater and perhaps more general bloodshed. Everybody would be glad to recognize the autonomy of the Slavonic Provinces if such were established. His belief was, that Turkey would, if asked by the Great Powers, grant autonomy to the Christian populations under her rule, rather than let it be granted to them by Russia. However that might be, they ought to take an early opportunity of letting it be known to Turkey that we could no longer stand sponsor of a Mahomedan Government which had ceased to deserve the respect of civilized Nations, and which had done all it could to call down upon itself the just indignation of humanity and of Heaven.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, that he had seen in the Press, and had heard it stated that evening, that the public, or, at least, a certain portion of the public, strongly condemned certain expressions which had fallen from the Prime Minister with respect to outrages in Bulgaria. He had heard what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman on the subject, and he must say that, instead of treating the alleged atrocities with anything like indifference, the right hon. Gentleman gave utterance to language which showed his abhorrence of them. On the 10th of July the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "With respect to the reports of the terrible atrocities to which the right hon. Gentleman has referred, I would still express a hope that when we become better informed—I would express this hope for the sake of human nature itself—when we are thoroughly informed of what has occurred it will be found that the statements are scarcely warranted."

And the right hon. Gentleman called them "terrible scenes" and "heart-rending statements"—in short, he (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) did not think anyone could stigmatize the acts attributed to the Turks in Bulgaria more severely. He alluded to these things in order to show how groundless were the attacks which had been made on the right hon. Gentleman. For his own part, he came down to the House after reading the Papers, very much prejudiced against the conduct of Sir Henry Elliot; but he thought the Under Secretary of State had done a great deal to put his conduct in a more favourable light than he had anticipated. A great deal of what had occurred was, in his opinion, due to the want of information at the Foreign Office, owing to a certain looseness among some of our agents abroad and of diminution in the number of our agents in places where they ought to exist. Both at Constantinople and some of the outposts our diplomatic and Consular agents were, from the society in which they mixed, apt to have feelings more in favour of the Turks than the Christians. He thought the Foreign Office ought to have had from our Consuls and other agents in Bosnia and Herzegovina some information as to the condition of the Christians, and of the feeling which had led to these events. He could not help thinking that the Ottoman Government were somewhat guilty of an offence against the comity of nations when they brought these Circassians from Asia and settled them in Europe, where they were necessarily a menace to the Christian population from their faith and from their wild habits. At the same time Philippopolis was only 300 miles from Constantinople, and was easily accessible by rail; and he regretted that Sir Henry Elliot had not of his own accord sent his own agents to the places where these outrages occurred, so as to ascertain the truth upon the subject, without waiting for instructions from Her Majesty's Government. He quite agreed that Ministers abroad were overworked, and he did not blame Sir Henry Elliot very severely, because he was suffering from illness, and therefore, like many others, might have failed to do the right thing at the right moment. It was to be regretted that the example set in the case of the massacres in Syria in 1860, when Commissioners were sent to investigate the murders, was not followed in this case. He did not share any of the fears expressed with regard to Russia. Her great influence over the Christian Provinces of Turkey was derived from their expectation of favours to come, and he believed that England would hold the same position and possess the same influence with these people if they showed the same sympathy as Russia and manifested an interest in their future. Not only that, but the unfounded fears entertained with regard to Russian influence in Greece showed that in the present instance all fears of Russian influence might be dismissed. The desire of England was to see Turkey peaceful, but her Christian Provinces would never be peaceful or contented as long as their Government was of so abnormal a character. He suggested that Turkey should be asked to call a conference for the consideration of the future government of these Provinces. That course had been adopted with respect to Roumania. A Commission, at which Sir Henry Bulwer was the British Representative, proceeded to Bucharest, held an inquiry into the state of the Province, and the result was that a form of government was agreed to which, although since modified in some respects, had formed the basis of all future arrangements. He commended that precedent to the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, which, he could see, was really powerful in Eastern matters. Turkey asked England to join in the Andrassy Note, and any proposal made from England would receive the earnest attention and respect of Turkish statesmen. The charges made against Her Majesty's Government had been obliterated by the statements of those who had advanced these charges, for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford read a passage from one of Lord Derby's despatches with which, he said, he entirely agreed; and the fact that an officer had been despatched to the Turkish head-quarters to accompany the Turkish troops into Servia was a guarantee that such atrocities as they had heard of would not be committed any longer. He could not attribute the atrocities to the complicity or even the *laches* of Her Majesty's Governmennt; they were due to circumstances which were not foreseen, and he thought what had taken place would show the Government what was the wish of the country, and that they might now separate for the Recess with full confidence that these atrocities would not occur again.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, his hon. Friend the Member for Poole (Mr. Evelyn Ashley) was justified by the important discussion which had taken place in calling the attention of the House to this subject. It was a question in which, without a doubt, in the opinion of this country, and certainly of Europe, the reputation and fair fame of England were involved. He was not going into any elaborate argument whether England was more or less pledged in respect to the good conduct of Turkey; but he entirely agreed that the Government incurred a great responsibility in declining to join the other Powers in the Berlin Memorandum, the one object of which was to secure the pacification of Turkey and the protection of the Provinces. He was not, however, going to argue this question, for the Government admitted it in what they had done during the last fortnight or ten days. Why had they sent a Vice Consul to Philippopolis and a general officer with the Turkish Army to Servia, if they did not feel that they had a responsibility in this matter towards this country and Europe, and had tardily come to the conclusion that it was their bounden duty to fulfil that obligation? Every act they had done and were now doing was entirely inconsistent with the allegation that they were not responsible for seeing that such atrocities as these were not to be committed in future. If that were so, then there must be an exactly similar responsibility for the outrages that had been committed in the past. Then arose the question, How had that responsibility been discharged? That was a question to which he thought there could be only one answer. His hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State had made an apologetic speech which everybody in this country would, he was sure, be only too willing to accept, on behalf of Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople. But the question was, What had been done? The House approved what was now being done according to the despatches which had been received within the last few days, in sending a Vice Consul to Philippopolis and a general officer to Servia. The question, however, which the English people asked, was not what was done at the end of July and the beginning of August, but why the same measures had not been taken at the beginning of May? Why was the action of the Government delayed until it was too late to save a whole Province from desolation and a whole population from murder? That was the question which was asked in every corner of England and in every quarter of Europe. The answer given to that question on behalf of the Government of a great country was, "We knew nothing about it." What an answer for a Government which undertook to maintain the integrity of Turkey! They did not know that 12,000 innocent, inoffensive, and unresisting people had been slaughtered by their Allies in the month of May. If there ever was a spectacle of diplomatic impotence and administrative incapacity, it was that which was exhibited in the Papers which were now under the consideration of the House. From the First Minister of the Crown down to the Consul at Adrianople, there seemed not to be a man who, at the moment when the East was occupying the attention of the country, knew that these massacres and horrors were going on. How could such a state of things as that arise? His hon. Friend the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, indeed, admitted with admirable simplicity, that the Government had learnt all about them from the newspaper correspondents. He was glad, he must say, at all events, that after being denounced in that House and vilified in the Conservative Press, it was at last acknowledged that the reputation of England, which had been neglected by Her Majesty's Government and overlooked by our Representatives abroad, had been vindicated by the newspaper correspondents. He had said that the Papers which had been laid before the House were a monument of diplomatic incapacity, but if anything were wanting to crown the edifice, it would be the speech of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who, rising on an occasion like the present, could tell the House of Commons, and through it the English nation and Europe at large, what was the true history of the insurrection in Bulgaria, and that not in the language of a British Consul, or of our Representative at Constantinople, but in the language of *The Levant Herald*, which was at the last moment sent over, not, he was happy to say, by the Ambassador, but he supposed by some young *attaché*, as the best apology for the incompetence of our diplomacy. He hoped Sir Henry Elliot was not responsible for it, for he must, of course, have known that every statement in that account was open to the charge of being absolutely untrue. It was contradicted by the Papers which he had himself sent over, and by the Report of Mr. Baring. His hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State had called his hon. Friend the Member for Poole to account for having missed some lines in a paper which he read; but when he himself read the account from *The Levant Herald*, and took credit for the wonderful accuracy of some of the statements, he omitted the words—

> "There are no serious grounds for those estimates which are gratuitous and are derived from suspicious quarters. If any one would go to the trouble of making a right estimate of the number of men missing from the different villages, the result would be that it would be found to be hardly more than 3,000."

And that was stated in the face of our own Representative, Mr. Baring, who put the number slaughtered at 12,000. These statements had been published in *The Levant Herald*, in order that they might be read in that House by the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. If he wanted to point to the culmination of diplomatic incapacity in these transactions, he need only refer to a paper being cited as an apology for the ignorance and want of energy displayed by our Representatives abroad, which contained statements which everybody knew to be false, and to which the lie was given by Mr. Baring's Report, who said that 60 villages had been burnt down, almost the whole of them, by the Turks. Well, what had been the conduct of the affairs of a great country to justify its action in the face of Europe with respect to those abominable transactions? The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs asked, with great innocence, what the Government ought to have done? He (Sir William Harcourt) would tell them. Why, he would ask, had they not done in May what they had done in July? On the 23rd of June the newspaper correspondents, who could do it seemed what the Government could not, told the English people the truth in the matter. The Government was, thereupon, challenged, and the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office could only reply that he knew nothing about it, and that the accounts could not be true. That was on the 26th of June; and, if Lord Derby had then sent a telegram to Sir Henry Elliot to despatch some person to know what had really occurred, the whole story might have been known to the Prime Minister within a week. The Secretary of State said he would inquire. A fortnight elapsed—and the House knew what a fortnight was in this matter—after that Mr. Baring was sent, and news of him was heard within three days. *The Daily News* correspondent telegraphed on the 1st of August from Tatar Bazardjik that Mr. Baring was there. Why was Mr. Baring's Report not here? What did *The Daily News* correspondent see? He told us he saw 7,000 corpses, most of them women and children. Was that true? Why had they not Mr. Baring's account that morning of what he had seen? Lord Derby had allowed more than a fortnight to elapse from the date when a Question was put to him in the House of Lords on the subject, before he addressed a letter of remonstrance to our Ambassador at Constantinople. He alluded to the letter on the 13th of July, which was rather a mild and weak one, although a much stronger one was sent the next day. The Prime Minister, in referring to those atrocities, in answer to a Question on the 10th of July, said, that they were in constant communication with the Ambassador—that wars of insurrection were always atrocious. That was not a condemnation of the atrocities, it was an extenuation of them; and beyond that, the right hon. Gentleman further said that the English people had done something of the same kind in Jamaica, and that there was no prison accommodation for the number of prisoners said to have been taken; while as to the reports of torture the right hon. Gentleman exercised his unrivalled powers of humour and sarcasm, saying he did not believe that torture existed among an historical people. [Mr. DISRAELI: No; an Oriental people.] He was sorry if he had misrepresented the right hon. Gentleman; nothing could be further from his intention. Reports were very often inaccurate, and he would not for a moment impute any levity to the right hon. Gentleman whose kindness of heart was well known. Well, what did all that prove? It proved that the Government at the time the right hon. Gentleman spoke was unaware of the magnitude of the events which had occurred or that language would never have been used. How, then, was it that this ignorance prevailed in the Cabinet? It did not appear that Sir Henry Elliot was solely responsible, because Consul Reade's Report unquestionably reached England on the 28th of June, while the Prime Minister used the language referred to on the 10th of July. And that Report, which was dated the 16th of June, stated not only that atrocities were going on, but that the object of them was to diminish as much as possible the number of Bulgarians in the disturbed districts, and that the Circassians were said to be doing that work with the apparent connivance of the authorities. Then, although that document was in the hands of the Foreign Secretary on the 28th of June, he did not for more than a fortnight—namely, on the 13th of July—afterwards address any instructions to Sir Henry Elliot. Consul Reade subsequently repeated his statement that there was a deliberate plan on the part of the Turks and the Turkish Government to exterminate the Christians in Bulgaria, and said he had seen the Turkish Commissioner, who had informed him that the whole of the inhabitants of a certain village had not been massacred, but only 700 out of 1,300. That was the Turkish Commissioner whose Report the House had received—a Report he might say which bore the stamp of mendacity in every line, and the publication of which was a disgrace to the Turkish Government. There was overwhelming evidence in the Papers that those massacres were done at the express instance of the Government of Turkey, and under the authority of its highest officers, who had been rewarded for their conduct, with the deliberate object of exterminating the Christian population of Bulgaria. Yet it was not, as he had said, till the 13th of July that Lord Derby instructed Sir Henry Elliot to make remonstrances to the Porte. The feeling among the *employés* of the English Government at Constantinople at that time was betrayed by the letter of Sir Henry Elliot, which, to his astonishment, the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs had pointed to as being creditable to Sir Henry Elliot and the English Government. He (Sir William Harcourt) was sorry to say he read the letter with very different feelings. Writing from Therapia on the 6th of July, Sir Henry Elliot said he had strongly recommended that an energetic commander should be appointed for the Irregular troops to be employed in Servia, pointing out that if the progress of those troops in that Principality was marked by barbarities upon an unresisting people what would happen? That the English Government would denounce these proceedings? No, but that the indignation awakened throughout Europe might become so great that the Government would be driven by the force of public opinion to interfere and put a stop to them. What language was that to use at such a juncture! The English Government would not interfere, unless it was driven to do so by the force of public indignation! Altogether that was, to his mind, one of the most extraordinary and least creditable letters which had ever been addressed by an English Ambassador to an English Government. But the main question was—why had nothing been done till the middle of July? These unhappy people were being slaughtered in May. How did it happen there was nothing known about it till two months afterwards? It was true that they had a Consul at Adrianople, within a few hours of the spot; but it had been said for him, by way of excuse, that he was paralytic; but if the Government were to carry out their Oriental diplomacy with paralytic instruments, they would succeed about as well with the rest of them as they had in these. It was not for want of warning that the Government had been guilty of this apathy, for under date the 7th of May there was a communication from Mr. Kyriatzi urging the disarming of Bashi-Bazouks in order to avert the danger of excesses. Again, on the 12th of May, Vice Consul Dupuis wrote to Sir Henry Elliot—

> "The local authorities, as well as the Turkish Beys here, are displaying great activity in the enrolment and equipment of Bashi-Bazouks and other volunteers, and batches of Turkish peasantry are continually arriving from the surrounding villages to be supplied with arms and ammunition."

Lord Derby therefore knew that the Turkish Government were arming these people. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government did not know it, as he had great and multifarious occupations; but the Foreign Office knew from the Papers sent home by Sir Henry Elliot that the Bashi-Bazouks were armed and doing infinite mischief, and that it was the duty of the British Government to remonstrate and to see that their remonstrance was attended to. Then it was said all that was not the doing of the Turkish Government, but the doing of those ruffians of their own accord. On the 16th of May, Consul Dupuis wrote to Sir Henry Elliot a different story, as follows:—

> "The general topic of conversation here the last few days is that the Bulgarians of the village of Otleukeui, refusing to surrender, and taking refuge in a church or monastery, were bombarded by the troops under Hafous Pasha, when upwards of 300 men, women, and children were slaughtered.
>
> "According to other accounts it is stated that Hafous Pasha sent to demand a parley, and three times summoned the place to surrender, but, his messengers having been killed by the villagers, they were attacked as described. Others, again, state that the insurgents were driven off by artillery with trifling casualties. The last item of intelligence I hear is that the troops have since surrounded the village of Avradano, and that, unless it surrenders, it is feared the inhabitants will share the same fate as those of Otleukeui.
>
> "Extraordinary activity is being displayed here by the authorities and others in recruiting, arming, and forwarding to the disturbed districts Bashi-Bazouks and Circassians. Observing, in the meanwhile, great numbers of these irregulars about the streets, I represented to the Governor-General that it was scarcely safe to the public tranquillity to allow those troops to circulate the streets armed, and suggested that they might be localized somewhere away from the city, as it was generally feared that the slightest provocation might produce unpleasant consequences. The Governor-General assured me that the inhabitants had no cause to fear these troops, and that he had taken every precaution to maintain public tranquillity, but that he could not help keeping the Bashi-Bazouks here until such time as they received their arms and necessaries, when they were immediately ordered off to the front. I do not hear of any disorders having been committed by these troops in Adrianople, but I am assured that, once outside the city, they gave themselves up to all kinds of violence, and to the firing on women and other defenceless people in the villages and roads in this vicinity."

Her Majesty's Government knew of those things in the middle of May, and yet they addressed remonstrances neither to Musurus Pasha in England nor to Sir Henry Elliot. They knew that those defenceless people were being murdered. But it was said that Sir Henry Elliot was making remonstrances at Constantinople. On the 24th of May Sir Henry Elliot reported that he had made a strong remonstrance about the Bashi-Bazouks; but what sort of remonstrance was it? Now, he did not profess to be versed in the technicalities of diplomacy; but he should have thought if Sir Henry Bulwer, or Lord Stratford de Redcliffe in former times, wanted to make a strong impression, he would have gone to the Porte himself, but Sir Henry Elliot sent his dragoman instead. That was the way in which he met the matter, and from it he (Sir William Harcourt) thought that Sir Henry, though he might otherwise be a most excellent person, was not fit for the post of Ambassador at Constantinople. That was, he believed, the first remonstrance, although he had known for more than a fortnight all that had been going on, and when there had been, he ventured to say, 10,000 people murdered. And this was the kind of remonstrance that was made—He made a representation to Raschid Pasha about the injudicious employment of the Bashi-Bazouks in Bulgaria, for which the Porte alone was responsible, and the Turkish Minister stated in reply that Imperial orders were sent yesterday directing the Bulgarian authorities not to resort to the services of the Circassian Irregulars, but it was then represented to the Turkish Minister that that was only doing away with one portion of the Bashi-Bazouks, and that the others were equally brutal and licentious. Thus the first representation they made was met by the Porte with a practical refusal, granting only half their request, and leaving the mischief confessedly unredressed. Yet our Government did not write a line until the 13th of July. They had that fact before them that the Bashi-Bazouks were employed in killing innocent and defenceless people, and they knew of it for six weeks without writing a word of remonstrance against it. On the 19th of May, Consul Dupuis said that reports reached him of the excesses committed by the Bashi-Bazouks and Circassians on defenceless people, adding—

> "How far the atrocities said to have been committed on both sides are true or are exaggerated I have no means of ascertaining."

What should have been our Ambassador's answer to that? Why, that he would send somebody to ascertain. He (Sir William Harcourt) said that our Government and Sir Henry Elliot in the whole of May and June had a knowledge of these things, and the means of knowledge forced on their attention, and they did nothing except to send a flabby remonstrance through a dragoman which was not regarded. Consul Reade's despatch of the 23rd of May, which reached Lord Derby on the 2nd of June, said—

> "There is a grave matter here which I should bring to your Excellency's knowledge, and that is the arming of the Mussulmans and Circassians in the vilayet, and the letting loose of the latter on the Bulgarians simply reported to be in revolt. The lawless character of these Circassians is notorious—they are not to be trusted at any time; to employ them therefore in the way I have stated at the present moment, is, in my opinion, to drive many, who have hitherto remained quiet, to revolt. . . . As regards the arming of the Mussulmans, a Frenchman who returned yesterday from an inland town, states that whilst he was there an order arrived from Rustchuk for the Mussulmans to arm at once, and this order was accompanied by an intimation to the effect that those who should be found unarmed would be punished. I am told that identical orders have been issued to other districts; if, therefore, the present rising, which was said to be dying out, assumes greater dimensions, I do not think it will be a matter of surprise."

They all knew there had been a deliberate plan to exterminate the Christians of Bulgaria. Sir Henry Elliot wrote on the 8th of June saying that the Bulgarian insurrection appeared to have been unquestionably put down. Why, the Turkish Government informed our Government that there had been no Bulgarian insurrection! Sir Henry Elliot, however, said it had been put down, though with cruelty and in some cases with brutality; and he added that the Irregulars had then been recalled. They never had been recalled; but on the 8th of June they were still doing their bloody work, and Mr. Baring on the 22nd of July found them still at that work. What was the use of a Consul or an Ambassador? and why was not some one despatched to see what was going on? The Prime Minister knew nothing about it when he was asked a Question on the 10th of July, but on the 14th of July Her Majesty's Government began to write strong letters. And why? Because of the information received from Consul Dupuis as to the treatment of Bulgarian women and girls belonging to the burnt villages. Did anybody believe, if a telegram was sent from England in the month of May, when the Berlin Note was in suspense, and the English Fleet were going to Besika Bay, saying that our Government demanded that not a single Bashi-Bazouk or Circassian should be armed, that it would not have been attended to? No one would impute to the Government or to any Englishman any indifference to transactions of this kind; but what they were bound to do was to point out the lamentable breakdown of their administrative and diplomatic service. If the British Government had telegraphed in the first week in May, the lives of these 12,000 persons who had been murdered might have been saved. While the eyes of all Europe were fixed on the Eastern Question, was it possible that 12,000 human beings could be massacred in cold blood and that the English Government should know nothing of it? Was it possible that this should go on two whole months, from the middle of May to the middle of July, and that all these lives should have been sacrificed in consequence of the diplomatic incapacity of their Representatives, when they might have obtained the necessary information in a few hours? He could not but think, without desiring to lay undue blame on particular individuals, that the story of the massacres in Bulgaria would always remain a dark blot in the history of Europe, and, in some respects, a reproach to the statesmanship of England. They might have prevented, they ought to have prevented, and they had not prevented them. But lamentations over the catastrophies of the past were unavailing. What they had to think of was the future. The cries of these slaughtered women and children would not go up to Heaven in vain. That Providence which governed the fortunes of nations was a Power which "out of evil still educeth good." They had learned a lesson late indeed, but soon enough, if they had learnt it thoroughly, and laid it to heart. Speaking for himself, at least, he was prepared to say he hoped to God they had at last done with the Turk. If they could not control his ferocity—and these transactions had shown that they could not—they had no right to prop up his tottering power. In the name of humanity and civilization let them sink beneath the crushing weight of their own wickedness. What was that Government of Turkey which they were told it was the policy of England to support? They had replaced one Sultan by another who was to inaugurate an era of reform. But what a Sultan and what a reform! The Government of Turkey was a Government tempered by assassination and maintained by massacre. What a spectacle did these Sultans offer to the world—a dynasty of worn-out and impotent debauchees, who let loose on mankind a horde of uncontrollable wild beasts. They could no longer accept complicity with a detested and detestable Government—an abominable and an abominated race. The handwriting of Belshazzar was already flaming on their walls. They had been weighed in the balance of European opinion, and their scale had kicked tho beam. For four centuries they had been the curse of Europe, Africa, and Asia. They had occupied the fairest portions of the globe, the famous cities of the East—the cradles of genius and of art; but where their hoofs had trodden the grass had never grown. Those famous spots, dear to the memories of mankind, were now the haunts of wild beasts, of which the worst were those who bore a human form. Europe had known how to deal with tyrannies less intolerable than these. The voice of their fathers was lifted against the detestable dynasty of Spain and that throne tottered to its fall. Statesmen whose fame yet lived rescued the soil of Greece from the hands of their brutal oppressors. The crimes of the Government of Naples cried aloud to Heaven for vengeance, and the cries of an oppressd people found an echo in the hearts of the English nation. His hon. Friend the Member for Poole (Mr. Ashley) had invoked that evening the shadow of a great name; but Lord Palmerston, when he gave a voice to the sentiments of England, employed accents very different from the flaccid and flabby tone of these despatches. But there remained a question which it was their right and their duty to address to the Government even in the last days of an expiring Session, and it was this — Was not the time at last come to "do justice and to work mercy?" Were they to sit by for ever with hands folded and eyes closed whilst such things were done beneath the shadow of our prowess? They had been told they were to "keep the ring." Yes; but was there not something of hypocrisy in passing Vivisection Bills, whilst they kept the ring of Tatar Bazardjik? In his opinion, England was ashamed of the degrading occupation of keeping the ring for such transactions as these. It was time that the great interests of civilization and humanity should cease to be the base counters in a game of diplomatic chicane. The moment was never more favourable for a European settlement. France and Italy, Germany and Austria, had insisted, nay, entreated their cooperation. But then the Russian terror was invoked. That nightmare seemed to haunt their dreams and distort their judgment. But what reason was there to allege that in this matter the conduct of Russia had been wanting in moderation? Indeed, considering her national sympathies and the terrible nature of the provocation, it seemed to him that her self-restraint had been astonishing. No doubt Nicholas was a headstrong and violent despot, whom they were compelled to confront by arms. But the present Emperor, under circumstances of the greatest difficulty, had proved himself a true friend of peace. Europe owed him that acknowledgment. It was idle to deny that, apart from any schemes of territorial aggrandizement, the sympathy of Russia with the Slavonic populations of Turkey was national and inevitable. But what reason was there to suppose that the Czar was unwilling to come to some reasonable arrangement to protect those interests, which should in no way be prejudicial to their dominions in the East. As a matter, not of sentiment, but of policy, let him ask them in what position they would stand if they presented themselves as the sole obstacle to such a settlement? They would stand confessed before the world as the abettors of these murderous barbarians. They would present Russia to the world in a character which would give her more strength than all her armies—in the character of the champion of an oppressed and a Christian race. Was that a wise or a politic course for England with her vast interests in the East? Was that the way to increase and to maintain her authority? Let them think of the future. The future could not and would not belong to those decrepid ruffians. He had hoped, and he still hoped, that England might take a proud and a worthy place in the vindication of a noble policy. In common with other hon. Members of the House he had read with satisfaction the despatch of Lord Derby of August 9th—a despatch which seemed at last to breathe the spirit of an English Minister. The only thing to be lamented was that it was written in August—if it had been written in May, when there was just as good reason for writing it, those crimes might have been averted. But what did that despatch say? It said—"The indignation of Europe would become uncontrollable." He hoped it would become as uncontrollable as the ferocity of the Turks. Lord Derby had shown himself on that occasion at least a sagacious man. He could foresee that the tide of European opinion was rising, and that it would sweep away the petty sand castles which a feeble diplomacy was raising on an unstable beach. It would carry onward on its vast and resistless waves the fortunes of those Powers, whosoever they might be, who would emancipate Europe from the curse which afflicted her, and redeem Christendom from the shame by which she had been too long dishonoured.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Poole (Mr. Evelyn Ashley) has called attention to an important and interesting subject to-night in a manner very irregular, I think, not to say unprecedented. If the hon. Gentleman really believes that the the conduct of Her Majesty's Government with respect to these transactions and of the Queen's Ambassador is deserving of censure and disapprobation, I think he ought to have come forward with a distinct Motion on the subject. Although we are on the point of Prorogation, he knows enough of me to know that my advice to the Sovereign would be not to prorogue Parliament if he desired to challenge our policy; and even in a House like this, if he had given Notice, the opinion of the House of Commons might be taken about it. It appears to me to be a course scarcely, I should think, pleasant to a man of a mind such as I believe is possessed by the hon. Gentleman to avail himself of a Parliamentary privilege, which I do not care to admit or deny, to insinuate an offensive opinion upon the Advisers of the Crown and upon the conduct of absent Ambassadors, when he knows we have no means, in the present state of affairs, of testing the opinion of Parliament or of the country upon the subject. ["Oh, oh!"] Let me at once place before the House what I believe is the true view of the circumstances which principally interest us to-night, for after the Rhodian eloquence to which we have just listened, it is rather difficult for the House to see clearly the point which is before it. The Queen's Ambassador at Constantinople, who has at all times no easy duty to fulfil, found himself at the end of April and in the first three weeks of May in a position of extreme difficulty and danger. Affairs in Constantinople never had assumed—at least in our time certainly—a more perilous character. It was difficult to ascertain what was going to happen; but that something was going to happen, and something of a character which might disturb the relations of the Porte with all the Powers of Europe, and might even bring about a revolution, the effect of which would be felt in distant countries, there was no doubt. The House is well acquainted with the train of strange incidents which occurred, all of them events that tried the intelligence, the vigilance, and the thought of our Ambassador there to the utmost, and, in circumstances of great difficulty, I think he showed an intelligence, a courage, and a calmness which were highly beneficial to the course of public affairs. The hon. and learned Gentleman who has just addressed us in so learned and powerful an oration—[*Laughter.*]—well, I speak what I feel; I look upon him as one of the chief orators of the House—although sometimes he lavishes, as he has done on this occasion, his great powers upon subjects which are not quite adequate to the treatment. In the present instance the hon. and learned Gentleman has made one assumption throughout his speech—that there has been no communication whatever between the Queen's Ambassador at Constantinople and Her Majesty's Ministers upon the subject in discussion; that we never heard of these affairs until the newspapers published accounts, which were brought under the notice of both Houses of Parliament, and from that assumption he draws all those inferences so flattering to Her Majesty's Government which have been recently communicated to the House. The state of the facts is the reverse. From the very first period that these transactions occurred — from the very commencement—the Ambassador was in constant communication with Her Majesty's Ministers. ["No, no!"] Why, that may be proved by the Papers on the Table. Throughout the months of May and June the Ambassador is constantly referring to the atrocities occurring in Bulgaria, and to the repeated protests which he is making to the Turkish Government, and informing Her Majesty's Government of interviews and conversations with the Grand Vizier on that subject. The hon. and learned Gentleman says that when Questions were addressed to me in this House I was perfectly ignorant of what was taking place. But that is exactly the question we have to decide to-night. I say we were not perfectly ignorant of what was taking place, and that is the very point I am now calling attention to. I say during all this period we were, I will not say daily, but constantly receiving communications from Her Majesty's Ambassador informing us of what was occurring in Bulgaria, and apprising the Government of the steps he took to counteract evil consequences. What did take place was this—When certain statements were made in this House we said we were in constant communication with Sir Henry Elliot, and that the information which reached us did not warrant the statements that were made. I agree with my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke), who has on two occasions addressed himself to the subject with great knowledge and ability, that even the slightest estimate of the horrors that occurred in Bulgaria is quite sufficient to excite the indignation of the country and of Parliament; but when you come to say we were ignorant of all that was occurring, and did nothing to counteract it, because we said in answer to Questions that the information which had reached us did not warrant the statements that were quoted in the House—these are two entirely different questions; and therefore it becomes us to consider what were the statements made in this House. In the newspaper which had been referred to, the first account was, if I recollect aright, that 30,000 or 32,000 persons had been slain; that 10,000 persons were in prison—[Mr. W. E. FORSTER: There is no mention of that in the first statement.] Well, it may have been in the second that it was made. It was also stated that 1,000 girls had been sold in the open market; that 40 girls had been burnt alive in a stable; and cartloads of human heads paraded through the streets of the cities of Bulgaria—these were some of, though not all, the statements made; and I was perfectly justified in saying that the information which had reached us did not justify those statements, and, therefore, we believed them to be exaggerated. Is that fact true, or is it not? Now that we have arrived at a position in some degree to realize the truth of the terrible results that did occur, is the truth most like what we believed to be the case, or that which was brought forward as the foundation of the Questions of the right hon. Gentleman? I maintain that the statements we made in Parliament were quite justified. Lord Derby telegraphed to Sir Henry Elliot a second account, which appeared in *The Daily News*, stating that in the Tatar-Bazardjik district, in Bulgaria, cartloads of heads of women and children were boastfully paraded, and that young women were regular articles of traffic, and were being sold publicly in the villages by Tartars and Turks. Lord Derby added that it was very important that Her Majesty's Government should be able to reply to the inquiries made in Parliament respecting these and other statements, and directed Sir Henry Elliot to inquire by telegram of Consuls, and report as soon as he could. All these statements are untrue. There never were 40 maidens locked up in a stable and burnt alive. That was ascertained with great care by Mr. Baring, and I am surprised that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford should still speak of it as a statement in which he has confidence. I believe it is an entire fabrication. I believe, also, it is an entire fabrication that 1,000 young women were sold in the market as slaves. We have not received the slightest evidence of a single sale, even in those journals on which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford founded his erratic speech. I have been attacked for saying that I did not believe that it was possible to have 10,000 persons in prison in Bulgaria. So far as I can ascertain from the Papers there never could have been more than 3,000. As to the 10,000 cases of torture, what evidence is there of any case of torture? We know very well there has been considerable slaughter; that there must have been isolated and individual cases of most atrocious rapine and outrages of a most atrocious kind; but still we have had communications with Sir Henry Elliot, and he has always assumed from what he knew that these cases of individual rapine and outrage were occurring. He knew that civil war was carried on there under conditions of brutality which, unfortunately, are not unprecedented in that country; and the question is, whether the information we had justified the extravagant statements made in Parliament which no one pretends to uphold and defend. We were asked if we had information which justified us in supposing they were authentic? We replied that we were in daily communication with our Ambassador, who was in constant communication with Consuls, and that nothing which reached us warranted those extravagant statements which nobody now professes to believe. The hon. and learned Gentleman kindly excused me for not having seen the Report of Consul Reade, on the score of my multifarious duties; but I do not think my multifarious duties are any excuse for the neglect of business, and I can assure the House there is not a despatch which reaches or leaves the country which it is not my intention to see, and I scrupulously fulfil that duty; but it is a remarkable circumstance that that despatch of Consul Reade, through no inadvertence of mine, was forwarded to another person; a delay arose, and it never reached me until 10 days after the Question was asked. I wish to vindicate myself on that point. The hon. and learned Gentleman has done full justice to the Bulgarian atrocities. He has assumed as absolutely true everything that criticism and more authentic information had modified, and in some instances had proved not merely to be exaggerations but to be absolute falsehoods. And then the hon. and learned Gentleman says—"By your policy you have depopulated a Province." Well, Sir, certainly the slaughter of 12,000 individuals, whether Turks or Bulgarians, whether they were innocent peasants or even brigands, is a horrible event which no one can think of without emotion. But when I remember that the population of Bulgaria is 3,700,000 persons, and that it is a very large country, is it not a most extravagant abuse of rhetoric to say that the slaughter of so considerable a number as 12,000 persons is the depopulation of a Province? Well, but then the hon. and learned Gentleman makes a severe attack upon the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State, because he referred as an authority to *The Levant Herald*. Now, *The Levant Herald* is a newspaper which, I believe, is of considerable authority, and is distinguished for its authentic information. That article in *The Levant Herald* I may not have read with all the critical acumen of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford; but, certainly, as I read it, there were many points which I felt as I went on were substantiated by official Papers, the whole of which I believe are now on the Table of the House. And I cannot understand how it is that those who are so ready sometimes to exaggerate the importance of newspaper communications, and to assert, as two hon. Gentlemen, Members of the late Government, have done this evening, that they are more authentic than diplomatic despatches, should say that *The Daily News* should be such an absolutely infallible authority upon those matters, and that *The Levant Herald* should be flouted and treated with all the scorn which the hon. and learned Member for Oxford has poured upon it. I cannot see why the information of *The Levant Herald* is to be treated in that manner. It is to be weighed fairly. Its statements are not to be accepted without adequate consideration; but I do not place it, as regards having confidence in its information, lower than any other newspaper. And I have always heard—I know it was so in old times; I do not know myself if it be so at present—that it was an authority much looked up to; and I have never heard anything about its management or character to give any reason to treat its authority with contempt. But when I find its statements agree and tally with the statements in the published despatches, I naturally say that it gives me a prejudice in favour of its veracity. ["Oh, oh!"] And I have no doubt, Sir, that if *The Levant Herald* were to publish some evidence to-morrow which would tell in favour of the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, or the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Oxford, we should have that journal held up as containing infallible proof of the fact, and who should dare attempt to depreciate its authority, or to question its veracity. We should have had nothing but high laudation, instead of the denouncing phrases which fell upon us to-night. Well, the hon. and learned Gentleman said also that Her Majesty's Government had incurred a responsibility which is not possessed by any other country as regards our relations with Turkey and our influence with the Turks. I say we have incurred no responsibility which is not shared with us by all the other contracting Powers to the Treaty of Paris. I utterly disclaim any peculiar responsibility. He asks, why did we not send a Consul to Philippopolis at once? and why did we not at once appoint a Military Attaché to the Turkish Army? Why should we have sent a Consular Agent to Philippopolis? Why send a Military Attaché to the Turkish Army? To do so does not involve us in any peculiar responsibility—it is only the exercise by Her Majesty of one of her rights and duties. It has nothing to do with Treaties or with diplomatic responsibility. Her Majesty has a right to send a Consular Agent to any place she thinks fit, and she has a right, if the Sovereign of the country agrees to it, to send a Military Attaché to the armies of the belligerents. The very fact that we were obliged properly to appeal to the Porte for their permission before we appointed General Kemball, shows that it was no intrusion and no undue or unjust interference with the Government of the country, but that we were only fulfilling our duties as an independent State in connection with another independent State; and to attempt to mix up those two simple acts on the part of the Queen with diplomatic engagements, and responsibility of a peculiar nature arising from those diplomatic engagements, is really to introduce a preposterous element into the debate. I am asked why it is that because we have in August agreed to send a Vice Consul to Philippopolis, we did not do so in May? Does anyone believe that if a Vice Consul had been sent to Philippopolis in May it would have prevented the disastrous events that have occurred? It is quite impossible to suppose anything of the kind. What we have done now in a place where I am sorry to say we have no commercial relations will at least lay the basis of some better means of communication in that country, and we should have better communication with Turkey at present if, unfortunately, some years back there had not been a Liberal assault on the Consular system, which reduced the number of Turkish Vice Consuls. The hon. and learned Gentleman told the Government—"There is a question now which you must face, and that question is, why do you stand out as an obstacle to the settlement of a great question from pure jealousy of Russia?" I should like to know, in the first place, what is this great question to the settlement of which we stand out as an obstacle. The hon. and learned Gentleman, although he has seldom had greater command of eloquence, and although he appears to have given the subject great consideration, never told us what the real question was, and when he taunted us so indignantly with being an obstacle to the settlement of this great question, he never ventured to define it, except, indeed, that he did intimate that it was the duty of England, in combination with Russia and the other Powers, to expel the whole Turkish nation from Eastern Europe. That an hon. and learned Gentleman, once a Member of a Government, and an ornament of that Government, and one who would in future be one of our eminent statesmen, that, after having experienced a sense of political responsibility, he should get up on the last day of the Session, and, with the conviction that from his glowing and animated words the country might be disturbed for the next six months at least, should counsel as the solution of all these difficulties that Her Majesty's Government should enter into an immediate combination to expel the Turkish nation from Eastern Europe, does indeed surprise me. And because we are not prepared to enter into a scheme so Quixotic as that would be, we are held up by the hon. and learned Gentleman and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford as having given our moral, not to say our material assistance, to the Turkish people and the Turkish Government. We are always treated as if we had some peculiar alliance with the Turkish Government, as if we were their peculiar friends, and even as if we were expected to uphold them in any enormity they might commit. I want to know what evidence there is of that, what interest we have in such a thing. We are, it is true, the Allies of the Sultan of Turkey; so is Russia, so is Austria, so is France, and so are others. We are also their partners in a tripartite Treaty, in which we not only generally, but singly, guarantee with France and Austria the territorial integrity of Turkey. These are our engagements, and they are the engagements that we endeavour to fulfil. And if these engagements, renovated and repeated only four years ago by the wisdom of Europe, are to be treated by the hon. and learned Gentleman as idle wind and chaff, and if we are to be told that our political duty is by force to expel the Turks to the other side of the Bosphorus, then politics cease to be an art, statesmanship becomes a mere mockery, and, instead of being a House of Commons faithful to its traditions and which is always influenced, I have ever thought, by sound principles of policy, whoever may be its Leaders, we had better at once resolve ourselves into one of those revolutionary clubs which settle all political and social questions with the same ease as the hon. and learned Member. Sir, we refused to join in the Berlin Note, because we were convinced that if we made that step we should very soon see a material interference in Turkey; and we were not of opinion that by a system of material guarantees the great question which the hon. and learned Gentleman has adverted to would be solved either for the general welfare of the world or for the interests of England, which, after all, must be our sovereign care. The Government of the Porte were never for a moment misled by the arrival of the British Fleet in Besika Bay. They were perfectly aware when that Fleet came there that it was not to prop up any decaying and obsolete Government, nor did its presence there sanction any of those enormities which are the subjects of our painful discussion to-night. What may be the fate of the Eastern part of Europe it would be arrogant for me to speculate upon, and if I had any thoughts on the subject I trust I should not be so imprudent or so indiscreet as to take this opportunity to express them. But I am sure that as long as England is ruled by English Parties who understand the principles on which our Empire is founded, and who are resolved to maintain that Empire, our influence in that part of the world can never be looked upon with indifference. If it should happen that the Government which controls the greater portion of those fair lands is found to be incompetent for its purpose, neither England nor any of the Great Powers will shrink from fulfilling the high political and moral duty which will then devolve upon them. But, Sir, we must not jump at conclusions so quickly as is now the fashion. There is nothing to justify us in talking in such a vein of Turkey, as has, and is being at this moment entertained. The present is a state of affairs which requires the most vigilant examination and the most careful management. But those who suppose that England ever would uphold, or at this moment particularly is upholding, Turkey from blind superstition and from a want of sympathy with the highest aspirations of humanity are deceived. What our duty is at this critical moment is to maintain the Empire of England.

Nor will we ever agree to any step, though it may obtain for a moment comparative quiet and a false prosperity, that hazards the existence of that Empire.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL.

(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

[BILL 250.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short title) *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Prohibition of painful experiments on animals).

MR. LOWE, in moving, as an Amendment, in page 1, line 2, to leave out "give pain," and insert "torture," said, that the clause created a new offence—the "giving pain" to animals. He thought the word "torture" ought to be substituted.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS opposed the Amendment, and hoped that it would not be pressed.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (General restrictions as to performance of painful experiments on animals.)

MR. LOWE said, that under the clause physicians and surgeons would not be permitted to perform operations on animals without the certificate of the Secretary of State. The clause would not give as good a security as was already given by the fact that those gentlemen had already gone through a complete course of medical and surgical study, and had received from a competent authority a certificate to practise their profession. He was surprised that medical men were not sufficiently alive to their own interests as to oppose the clause as much as possible. In his opinion it would lower them in the estimation of the public, if the clause was passed. He would therefore move the insertion of words confining the Secretary of State's certificate to persons who had not received a regular medical education.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 30, after the word "performed," to insert the words "by a physician or surgeon, or."—(*Mr. Lowe.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he would infinitely have preferred to have seen the Medical Profession undertaking to regulate itself in this respect, and thus to have rendered any interference on the part of Parliament unnecessary. It ought to be borne in mind that not only had they refused to adopt any regulations of their own, but had protested against any interference whatsoever.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK deprecated the remarks of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire as unfair, because the Medical Profession had no organization by which they could make regulations in the matter. The British Association Committee laid down certain rules, and the evidence taken before the Royal Commission showed that the principles laid down by those rules had been honourably carried out by the Profession.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS opposed the Amendment.

DR. WARD contended that it was most unreasonable to propose that members of the Medical Profession, who had set up a number of institutions, guaranteeing that they were fit to deal with even infant life, should be assumed to be unfit to have the handling of animal life entrusted to their skill and care.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, most of the arguments urged against it would have been more appropriate to the second reading of the Bill. The Bill was not meant as a slur upon the Medical Profession, for there could be no doubt of their care in dealing with human life, and the main reason why the present Bill was deemed necessary at all was, that it was thought advisable that the experiments to which it related should be performed under some regulations.

SIR WALTER BARTTELOT said, he was sorry the Government could not adopt the Amendment, as it implied a distrust of the Medical Profession, who did not deserve it. He looked upon it as a very strong measure indeed to call upon men who held so responsible a position in the country as the members of the Medical Profession to apply to a central authority for permission to make those experiments which they deemed to be necessary in the interests of humanity and science. If such a Bill as the present had been brought before the House early in the Session, he ventured to say it would have met with a very different fate from that which seemed to be now before it. It was another instance of centralization, against which he protested.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR contended that the Bill was inconsistent in its principles, by vesting powers for carrying them into effect in persons who had no medical diploma, and who were to authorize or interdict those who had been performing experiments. It would be hard to adopt a proposal that would have the effect of preventing some of the most experienced physiologists in the country from practising important experiments except under conditions that would operate harshly.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS reminded the right hon. Gentleman that the physiologists of the country had accepted the principle of the Bill. If the Amendment were adopted, the value of the Bill would be lost, and those who urged it might as well move its rejection at once.

MR. WHALLEY contended that it was altogether too late in the present Session to pass a Bill of this importance, and he would therefore move that the Chairman do leave the Chair. He did so, as he had no character to lose.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Whalley.*)

MR. LOWE hoped the Motion would not be pressed, as it could only result in a waste of time.

MR. ASSHETON could not see why physicians and surgeons should not come under the same rule as other classes.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK thought they might safely trust men who had been at great pains to qualify themselves for the pursuit of such a Profession in a matter of this kind. He could see no use in throwing upon the Secretary of State for the Home Department a duty additional to the many responsibilities which he was already called upon to assume.

MR. WHALLEY assented to his proposal being negatived.

Motion *negatived.*

THE LORD MAYOR (MR. ALDERMAN COTTON) said, the question was a subject of considerable interest in the City, and he approved of and was prepared to support the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London. As chief magistrate of the City of London, he had had very great pressure put upon him in this matter. He trusted that it would be considered that a man who had obtained his position as a medical man was worthy of all consideration, and he should not be obliged to obtain a licence from the Secretary of State before he could make experiments.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR thought that this elaborate praise of the Medical Profession was uncalled-for, as they already stood high enough in the opinion of the country. He thought, nevertheless, that the Bill was highly necessary. The question with the people of England was whether vivisection should be allowed at all in this country.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, it was to be assumed that medical men were qualified, but how was the Home Secretary to know that they were?

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF trusted that the Home Secretary would adhere to the principle of the Bill.

MR. WHITWELL did not think that the clause ought to pass. He earnestly hoped that the Home Secretary would accept the responsibility.

MR. BUTT considered that experiments by vivisectionists on human beings were different from those upon dogs and cats, which had no will in the matter; but when human beings were told that it was necessary in their cases to submit to vivisection, they could choose their own man, and it would therefore be unnecessary for a qualified medical man to apply to the Home Secretary for a licence.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 27; Noes 82: Majority 55.

Clause verbally *amended,* and *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Use of urari as an anæsthetic prohibited), *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Absolute prohibition of painful experiments on dogs and cats).

Mr. LOWE, in opposing the clause, said, he had a very strong objection to it, as it established an aristocracy of animals. Five animals were to be peculiarly favoured—the cat, the dog, the horse, the mule, and the ass. It was to him perfectly shocking that a selection should be made. Who were they that they should sit in judgment on these animals, and prefer one to another, inflicting pain on one and exempting others. If these experiments were made, they ought to be tried on the animals best suited for them, and a few ought not to be specially exempted.

Mr. WHALLEY believed that objectionable Bill originated with the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), and he suggested that country gentlemen who were in their sports ignorant, cruel, and prejudiced should be placed under surveillance.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS explained that those animals were favoured because they were the most intelligent, and consequently the most sensitive to pain. It must be remembered further that they were only excluded from experiments which were carried out without anæsthetics.

Clause *agreed to*.

Remaining clauses *agreed to*, with Amendments.

On the Motion of Mr. Assheton Cross, the following new Clause was *agreed to*, and *inserted* in page 8:—

(Prosecution of licensed person with sanction of Secretary of State).

"A prosecution under this Act against a licensed person shall not be instituted except with the assent in writing of the Secretary of State."

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS moved another new clause providing that the Bill should not apply to cold-blooded animals.

Clause—

(Act not to apply to certain animals.)

(This Act shall not apply to cold-blooded animals,)—(*Mr. Assheton Cross,*) —*brought up*, and read the first and second time.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER objected that the clause would exclude nine-tenths of the animals on which experiments were made.

Mr. WHALLEY moved that the Chairman should report Progress.

Motion *negatived*.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER then moved to substitute the word "invertebrate" for "cold-blooded."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "cold-blooded," in order to insert the word "invertebrate."—(*Mr. William Edward Forster.*)

Question put, "That the word 'cold-blooded' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 20; Noes 57: Majority 37.

On Question, "That the clause, as amended, be added to the Bill?"

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR characterized the change as a breach of the understanding between the Home Secretary and the medical men, and he was quite sure the Bill would not have been accepted had it been known that the word "cold-blooded" was to be struck out.

Question put, and *agreed to*.

Mr. LOWE moved the following new clause:—

(Penalty for torturing animals when there is no experiment.)

"Any person who, without submitting it to an experiment calculated to produce pain, shall cruelly abuse or torture any animal shall be liable, at the discretion of the Court before which he is tried, to a penalty not exceeding one hundred pounds, or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding three calendar months."

Clause (Penalty for torturing animals when there is no experiment,)—(*Mr. Lowe,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he must oppose the insertion of the clause as its intention was entirely foreign to the scope of the Bill.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 22; Noes 51: Majority 29.

House *resumed*.

Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*.

House adjourned at Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Saturday, 12th August, 1876.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland)* (235); Norwich and Boston Corrupt Voters* (234); Pensions Commutation Act Amendment* (236).

Second Reading — Committee negatived — Bow Street Police Court Site* (228); Expiring Laws Continuance* (229); Sheriff Courts (Scotland)* (222); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*.

Committee—Report—Legal Practitioners* (220); Suez Canal (Shares)* (221); War Department and Post Office (Remuneration, &c.)* (219).

Third Reading—Municipal Privileges (Ireland)* (211); Police (Expenses) Act Continuance* (212); Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment (Dublin)* (213); Elementary Education* (206); Pollution of Rivers* (227), and *passed.*

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, to Monday next, Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, 12th August, 1876.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee — Report — Third Reading*—Pensions Commutation Act Amendment* [230]; Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) [221], and *passed.*

Considered as amended—Third Reading—Cruelty to Animals* [250], and *passed.*

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

JUDICATURE BILL (IRELAND)—COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.—QUESTION.

MR. J. COWEN (for Mr. HOPWOOD) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it be true, as stated in the public papers in Ireland, that Mr. Arthur Henry Courtenay has been temporarily appointed Clerk of the Rules in the Court of Common Pleas by the Chief Justice of that Court; whether there are not several gentlemen in the office many years senior to Mr. Courtenay; whether the appointment is not one in the gift of the Crown, and whether Mr. Courtenay was recommended by his relative the Chief Justice; and, whether the advisers of Her Majesty will inquire into the matter and consider carefully the circumstances before making a permanent appointment?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The office of Clerk of the Rules in the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland became vacant a short time ago, and it was not thought advisable to fill it up pending the uncertainty whether the Irish Judicature Bill would become law this Session. But it was necessary, by statute, that provision should be made for the temporary discharge of the duties of the office; and Mr. Courtenay, a second-class clerk in the Common Pleas, possessing a Civil Service certificate, who had been appointed a clerk some years ago by Chief Justice Monahan, was selected by his relative Chief Justice Morris for this purpose. There are, I believe, three clerks in the office senior to Mr. Courtenay, but I know of no reason why, on this account, he should not have been selected for the temporary discharge of duties not of an ordinary clerical character, especially as this office is one which, from the provisions of the Act regulating it, was clearly not intended to be filled by seniority. The appointment is in the gift of the Lord Lieutenant, not of the Crown; and I have no doubt that the Lord Lieutenant will exercise his usual care in deciding how it shall be permanently filled.

EAST CLIFF AT DOVER.
OBSERVATIONS.

MAJOR DICKSON, who had a Notice on the Paper to ask the Secretary of State for War, Why a temporary bridge constructed for the repair of a public foot-path at East Cliff, Dover, was destroy on the 8th instant by order of the War Department? said, that having learnt since he gave this Notice that the matter was more complicated than he had at first supposed, he should meanwhile be satisfied with an assurance on the part of the right hon. Gentleman that it would receive careful consideration. His constituents were inclined to regard the destruction of the bridge as a high-handed act of the Department, but he would accept the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he had not yet had time to obtain the requisite information, but the matter would, of course, be fully inquired into.

PUBLIC HEALTH—VACCINATION ACTS—CASE OF JOSEPH ABEL.—QUESTION.

Mr. JAMES asked the President of the Local Government Board, If his attention has been called to the case of Joseph Abel, who has been fined five times since the 8th of March last, at the instance of the Faringdon Board of Guardians, for refusing to have his child vaccinated; whether it is the fact that in each case the maximum penalty has been inflicted by the local justices; and, whether the Board of Guardians have informed Mr. Abel that it is their intention to continue to enforce these proceedings until he complies with the Law; and if he will endeavour, as far as he is able, to arrest further proceedings being taken in this case?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, he was aware that Mr. Abel had been fined a number of times—no doubt five times, as stated by the hon. Member—at the instance of the Faringdon Board of Guardians for refusing to have his child vaccinated. He had communicated with the Guardians some weeks ago, stating the opinion of the Local Government Board that proceedings under the Vaccination Act should not be frequently repeated, especially when taken by the Guardians, and that it should be considered whether a repetition of prosecution was likely to result in the due observance of the law. The Guardians had replied fully and clearly to the communication of the Local Government Board, and had stated their reasons for considering it expedient to continue the prosecution in the present case. They stated that Mr. Abel was well to do, and was a member of the Anti-Vaccination Society, and that it was impossible to know how much of the fines was paid by the society. They had therefore given instructions for the prosecutions to be continued. In reply to the last Question, he had to state that he had given instructions to the Guardians to consider carefully the course they were taking. He could not say on general grounds that he agreed with the policy of the Guardians; but, at the same time, the law had vested them with a certain discretion, and it was not competent for him to interfere arbitrarily with their decision. He was unable to answer the two other specific questions, because he had not had time to communicate with the Guardians on the subject. He was not aware whether the maximum penalty had been inflicted, and still less was he aware that the Board of Guardians had informed Mr. Abel that it was their intention to continue to enforce these proceedings until he complied with the law. It was to be hoped they had not taken this step.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—EPISCOPAL SEE OF GIBRALTAR.—QUESTION.

Captain PIM (for Sir Eardley Wilmot) asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, What steps have been taken with regard to the re-issuing of Letters Patent constituting Gibraltar, as before, an Episcopal See, in accordance with the views of the members of the said Church contained in a Memorial to the Colonial Secretary?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Numerous proposals have from time to time been made for a re-adjustment of the relations subsisting between the Episcopal See of Gibraltar and the Crown and local Government, among others being the one contained in the Memorial referred to in the Question put by the hon. Gentleman. It may have escaped the recollection of the House that there was a short discussion on this subject some weeks since, in the course of which I pointed out that these difficulties arose out of the action of the late Government through the disestablishment of the Church in Gibraltar, and that Her Majesty's present Government, as I need scarcely remind the House, are in no shape or form responsible for the disestablishment of Churches, in Gibraltar or anywhere else. This, however, being the condition in which we found matters on taking office, there is no present intention of taking any steps in the direction indicated in the Memorial.

NAVY—H.M.S. "VANGUARD."

QUESTION.

Captain PIM asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, in the event of the "Vanguard" being successfully raised, the Government would purchase the ship; and, if so, whether they would be prepared to buy her for half her original cost, or what proportion of that cost would they pay for her?

MR. HUNT: The conditions of sale which are to be advertised have already been settled, and certain prices have been named for the guns and certain other prices for the stores on board the ship, which the Government will be prepared to pay. The Government have always been prepared to consider favourably any offer that may be made for other stores, or an offer for the raised ship herself. But I am not prepared to name a sum for the ship, because we are entirely in the dark as to the condition in which she will be when raised, supposing that she be raised.

NAVY—DESIGNS OF SHIPS OF WAR.

QUESTION.

CAPTAIN PIM asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will reconsider his decision, and at once appoint a committee to inquire into and report on Designs of our Ships of War, and their present state of efficiency?

MR. HUNT, in reply, said, that the intended appointment of this Committee had been postponed for reasons which he considered sufficient, and which had been urged upon him in the House, and that therefore he was not prepared to nominate such a Committee.

FIJI—THE LAND QUESTION.

QUESTION.

MR. WHITWELL (for Mr. Alderman M'ARTHUR) asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Government will send out instructions to Sir Arthur Gordon to expedite the settlement of the Land question in Fiji, so as to remove the difficulties which now exist in connection therewith, and thus facilitate the investment of capital in that Colony?

MR. J. LOWTHER: The difficulties which the hon. Gentleman very justly alludes to as existing in connection with the Land question in Fiji have necessitated a reference to the Law Officers of the Crown. Steps are, however, now about to be to be taken founded upon those opinions which, I hope, will ensure a speedy settlement of these matters by the Commission which is now sitting.

ARMY—MILITARY ETIQUETTE.

QUESTION.

MAJOR DICKSON asked the Secretary of State for War a Question, of which he had given him private Notice—namely, Whether his attention has been called to certain proceedings that took place on Wednesday last at the police-court at Canterbury, where an officer on duty was insulted and turned out of court by order of the presiding magistrate for refusing to remove his cap; and whether the military authorities intend by General Order or otherwise to vindicate this officer and protect officers in future from similar insults from ignorant and consequential magistrates?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he had never heard of the occurrence until his hon. Friend had spoken to him about it in the Lobby. He observed that it was stated in the report that an application was to made by the magistrates to the Home Office. The question would therefore come before his right hon. Friend, and no doubt he would apply to him (Mr. Hardy) on the subject if there was anything to be done further by the military authorities.

PARLIAMENT—RELEVANCY OF DEBATE—THE APPROPRIATION BILL.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. E. JENKINS, speaking to a point of Order, said, he had to put a Question to the Speaker with regard to the ruling from the Chair on the previous night on the subject of the limitation of the debates on the third reading of the Appropriation Bill. He should not have taken this course if there had not been some precedent which appeared to justify him in what he had proposed to do on the previous evening. The question was one of considerable interest and importance, because if private Members were to be limited in their discussions on the Appropriation Bill there was no doubt that a very considerable privilege would be taken away from them. The ruling, he might observe, was offered spontaneously from the Chair, and without any one rising to challenge him to Order. He had commenced his remarks on the third reading of the Bill by calling in question the domestic policy of Her Majesty's Government, which he considered was tending to weaken the position of that House and injure our ancient Constitution, whereupon the Speaker called him to Order, reminding him that any observations that were made must be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill; and, in answer to the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles Dilke), said that discussions on the Bill should be applicable to some of the clauses, and that, though these clauses had a wide application, he could not see how those of the hon. Member were relevant. Thereupon he (Mr. Jenkins) suggested whether the remarks he proposed to make were not as relevant as those of the hon. Member for Poole, seeing that Her Majesty's Ministers, whose conduct he was challenging, received salaries for which provision was made in the Bill. The Speaker then said that if he (Mr. Jenkins) proposed to call in question the salary of the First Minister, or any other Minister of the Crown, he would be in Order. The consequence was that he was obliged to forego the privilege of discussing the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, excepting with regard to their foreign policy. He found that Sir Erskine May, in his book on *Parliamentary Practice,* stated that—

> "It had been ruled that debates and amendments upon the different stages of the Appropriation Bill were to be governed by the same rules as those applicable to other Bills, and must, therefore, be relevant to the Bill, or some part of it, instead of being allowed the same latitude as that practised on going into the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means; but, as the grants comprised in the Bill are of great variety, a wide range of discussion was sometimes founded upon it without exceeding the limits of relevancy."—[p. 619.]

As to the custom and practice of the House, it was the habit of the late Mr. Hume upon the second or third reading of the Appropriation Bill to enter into a very long and varied criticism of the conduct of Her Majesty's Ministers. If he had really transgressed the Rules of the House it was not without having some ancient authority to fall back upon, and he ventured to call attention to this matter now, because he felt that if they were limited in their discussions upon this particular Bill, they should lose a great privilege, of which the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) availed himself last year to call attention to the fact that the Fenian prisoners were still in confinement, and as to which they should now have some accurate and defined statement of opinion from the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles Dilke) put a Question to me yesterday on this point, and I do not know that I have anything to add to the answer I then gave him. The Appropriation Bill is no exception to the general rule that debates should be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill before the House. It is obvious, however, that as the Appropriation Bill appropriates the several Supplies voted for the service of the year, that rule has a wide application in the case of the debate on that particular Bill. Since the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea put a Question to me on this point yesterday, I have referred to an authority which is justly of great weight in this House—namely, the work of Sir Thomas Erskine May on *Parliamentary Practice.* It is not necessary that I should quote it to the House, because the hon. Member has himself quoted the very passage which bears out substantially the rule which I stated last night.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not rise to question the ruling of the Speaker—it would be presumptuous of so young a Member as himself to do so —but he wished to ask whether the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) was in Order last year in the speech he made on the Motion for going into Committee on the Appropriation Bill, and whether the Leader of the Opposition was also in Order in making the speech which he did?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Baronet has put a Question to me which I think I am scarcely called upon to answer. It is not for me to rule now whether Members were in Order in former Sessions of Parliament.

Mr. BUTT would like to put this Question to the House—Would it not be competent for him to move on the Appropriation Bill, that the Supplies should be limited to three months, on the ground that he distrusted Ministers, and then to discuss the whole policy of the Government during the Session? If he was not mistaken in his recollection, something of that kind was done in the days of Pitt, upon the ground that Ministers were violating the privileges of the House of Commons and acting unconstitutionally. Modern usage, he confessed, tended to limit the privileges of the House, and to depart further and further from ancient custom.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, they could not help feeling that this question had been brought before them rather by surprise, and no advantage could result from their entering into any long discussion upon it. He thought the House would see that if the precedent which the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) referred to was one that took place, there would be an obvious difference between a Motion for limiting the amount of Supplies deliberately given and founded upon reasons which were stated, and a general discussion which might be initiated at any stage of the Bill, and which clearly might in Committee take any latitude whatever, because there was no subject, either foreign or domestic, upon which they might not raise a discussion by connecting it with the salary of some Minister. The rule laid down was a convenient one—namely, that no discussion should take place which was not relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill, and upon that point they had no guide except to submit to the judgment of the Speaker, who acted from his knowledge and study of the precedents and Rules of the House, and who always, he was sure, endeavoured to act in the spirit of those Rules. Although it might not be unnatural that the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. Jenkins) should put a Question as to the precise limits of the Rule, yet the House would not do wisely if they were to attempt now, by putting too many Questions to the Speaker, to limit his discretion, upon the due exercise of which the conduct of the Business of that House must depend.

MR. BECKETT-DENISON asked whether, assuming, as he did, that the ruling of Mr. Speaker was correct, the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Ashley) was in Order in bringing forward his Amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: It is not for me to answer any hypothetical Questions which may be put; but with reference to what has fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), I am by no means prepared to say that an Amendment on the Appropriation Bill limiting the Supplies to three months would be out of Order. As to the Question whether the hon. Member for Poole was in Order, I may say that although he made no Motion, yet he gave Notice of calling attention to certain matters, and it appeared to me that he was in Order, because he raised the question of supplies in a most direct manner. For instance, he asked whether it was proper that the naval forces of the country should be sent to Turkish waters in favour of a certain policy, and he also called in question the conduct of the diplomatic agents of the Crown, for whom Supplies had been appropriated. I think it right to observe that I interrupted the hon. Member for Dundee when he proposed to speak generally of the Constitution of the country, and it certainly appeared to me that such a discussion was scarcely relevant to the Appropriation Bill.

THE O'DONOGHUE observed, that it was unnecessary to corroborate anything that fell from Mr. Speaker; but he might be allowed to say that in reference to a Motion he placed on the Paper on the Appropriation Bill, he had received a communication in accordance with the ruling which had been referred to.

MR. E. JENKINS, in reply to the remark of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this discussion had come on by surprise, said, that last night he gave the Speaker Notice that he should bring the subject forward to-day.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that with reference to the observation of the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair that the hon. Member for Dundee was discussing the Constitution of the country, all he could say was that from what had fallen from that hon. Gentleman he inferred that he was about to make remarks precisely of a similar nature to those which fell last year from the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition.

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL.

Order for Consideration of Lords' Amendments read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Amendments made by the Lords to the Merchant Shipping Bill be now taken into consideration."

MR. MAC IVER, in moving—"That this House will, upon this day month, take the said Amendments into consideration," said, he felt that he owed an apology to the House for taking the very unusual course of rising at the eleventh hour to move the rejection of an important measure which had been long and carefully considered by the House, and had met with considerable approval. He had done his best hitherto to discuss the Merchant Shipping Bill in the most favourable manner, feeling that that course would be in accordance with the wishes of his constituents, and that it was also his duty, as far as possible, to support the measures of the Government. Merchant shipping legislation, however, was not in any way a Party question; and though, with all its faults, he believed the measure to be greatly better than any proposals that would have come from the other side of the House on the subject, he felt bound to oppose it on grounds far wider than anything relating to merchant shipping. He did not mean to say that he had not individual objections to certain clauses, and to some of the changes made by the House of Lords—and there was one clause in particular that would have a most serious effect in handicapping British steamers in the competition with foreign vessels to a greater extent than had been the case in previous years—but rather than ask the House to divide upon a technical question, he asked them to consider the measure with reference to their own privileges. Was it right, he asked, that at the end of the Session the House of Lords should make very large and material alterations in a Bill which had previously been fully considered in the Commons, and which was a Bill relating entirely to trade and commerce? He should endeavour to show three things—first, that the changes made in the Bill since it was considered so carefully in that House were really important; secondly, that there were a great many of them; and, thirdly, that the subject would not suffer anything, but would rather be benefited, by postponement till next year. He was far from objecting *in toto* to the Lords' Amendments. Those Amendments were mostly improvements, and they were improvements which were not likely to be lost by another year's consideration; but, on the other hand, the Lords had made some changes which were not improvements, which it was now impossible sufficiently to debate, which had not been before the country, and which further consideration would reverse. He strongly objected to Clause A, added by the Lords, the real meaning of which was to repeal so much of the Passengers Acts of 1855 and 1863 as applied to foreign shipping in British ports; and he also strongly objected to the alteration on the subject of costs. The practical working of that alteration, if it became law, would be, that nobody whose ship was improperly detained need ever seek compensation from the Board of Trade with any reasonable hope of obtaining the money otherwise than by an expensive lawsuit. These two provisions, added by the Lords, prompted him to move the rejection of the Bill; and he thought they sufficiently established his first point—namely, that the Lords' Amendments were important. To show that the Lords' Amendments were numerous, it was only necessary to ask the House to refer to the reprint of the Bill. The Bill left the Commons' with 40 clauses, and returned not merely with 5 entirely new clauses, but with 23 of the old ones altered; nor were these mere verbal alterations. One of these Amendments certainly was of very great importance, and it was one in which he heartily concurred. He need hardly remind the House that he had objected to the "misdemeanour clause" from the first, and that he had protested against it at every turn, and had been backed up by the respectable shipowning opinion of the great sea-ports. At last those protests had been heeded, and Clause 4 now returned from the House of Lords—still a bad clause—but certainly in a much less mischievous form. Nothing could have been worse than "the misdemeanour clause" as it left the House of Commons. It sought to prevent shipping disasters not merely by means which every practical man knew had already been "tried and found wanting," but by means which—besides being utterly futile as regarded the end in view—might any day result in the grossest injustice. The endeavour to prevent disaster by intensifying the responsibilities of shipowners would ever result in total failure, and could only end in placing private shipowners at greater disadvantage in the competition with limited liability companies; and as Clause 4 left the Commons a special responsibility was imposed upon "managing owners," which placed every such person in a *quasi*-criminal position that, in the vast majority of instances, was utterly undeserved. Fortunately for this country the Lords had struck out this provision, and done something to remedy the mistaken Board of Trade legislation inaugurated by the Merchant Shipping Act of 1871, and made worse by the "Herschell" Clause in the temporary measure of last Session. It might be interesting to the House to know how that Clause had worked. The utter uselessness of Clause 11 in the Act of 1871 he (Mr. Mac Iver) had repeatedly pointed out, and he would therefore only now refer to the Act of last Session. It was not for him to vouch for the accuracy of Board of Trade Returns, the more so that he was well aware the particular Return to which he was about to allude was by no means a reliable one. According to the Board of Trade figures, however, there had been about 800 unseaworthy vessels detained during the last three years. Assuming that Return were even half true, he asked where were the prosecutions? The House having heard so much from Board of Trade statesmen on both sides of the House of the great value of these misdemeanour clauses in the Act of last Session would probably expect to hear that there had been a considerable number of prosecutions; but there had only been two, and they were both unsuccessful. Of the second case he knew little further than that the Board of Trade did all they could to get a conviction, and failed. It was only reported in the newspapers a few days ago, and, for anything he knew to the contrary, that prosecution might or might not have been justifiable; but he had no hesitation whatever in saying that the only other prosecution which had yet been instituted under these clauses never ought to have been brought. The hon. Gentleman then described the case of Mr. Septimus Howell, managing owner of the schooner *Leader*, and said that he had obtained the facts from sources beyond any kind of suspicion. Referring as his authority to the Town Clerk of Chester, and to members of the Grand Jury in Liverpool, who had had Mr. Howell's case before them, he (Mr. Mac Iver) pointed out that Mr. Septimus Howell was a respectable man in a small way of business. The *Leader* was his first and only venture in shipowning, and in consequence of the death of a brother he became—in compliance with the Act of last Session—registered as the "managing owner." The vessel was an old one, and probably neither better nor worse than many other little coasting vessels that were reasonably fit for their work; but she had the misfortune to be seized upon by the Board of Trade, or rather they seized upon Mr. Howell, having allowed him to send his vessel to sea. He was arrested under a warrant, without any previous notice, and taken before the magistrates at Runcorn, who—after a patient hearing—dismissed the case; but the Board of Trade waited a month or two, and then attacked this unfortunate man again. No doubt the officers of the Board of Trade were desirous only of doing their duty; but under such circumstances it was natural that there should be a certain amount of *esprit de corps*, and that the Department should have "moved heaven and earth" to obtain a conviction, so that he did not think the officers were to be blamed. He blamed the law, and the system. The officers were expected to show some successful result from the "Herschell" Clause in the Act of last Session, and it was not their fault that they could not. But look at the hardship to Mr. Howell. He was taken from his home a second time under a warrant, and again locked up; and this time was tried before the magistrates at Liverpool, who, considering the case important, committed him for trial. They thought, no doubt, that the Board of Trade would never follow up Mr. Howell in this way, unless there were reasonable and probable grounds for supposing that he deserved punishment. In the end he was tried before Mr. Justice Brett, and acquitted without a stain on his character, the prosecution having utterly broken down. In view of facts like these it was a mockery to regard the provision that "no prosecution for misdemeanour can be instituted except by or with the consent of the Board of Trade" as in any sense a protection to respectable shipowners. What had happened to Mr. Howell might happen to any body, although less likely to happen to a man better able to take care of himself. The case of Mr. Howell, whose whole interest in shipping had consisted of a few hundred pounds, was a striking commentary upon the views so often expressed by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House responsible for the policy of the Board of Trade. They spoke of their desire to protect the "costermongers of the sea," and to avoid needless interference with trade—and they persuaded the House of Commons to accept the legislation under which these things became possible. Of course these hon. and right hon. Gentlemen spoke in entire good faith, but the plain truth was that they did not understand the practical effects of their own legislation. He was glad to see the hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) in his place, for he (Mr. Mac Iver) did not know anybody who was more to blame for leading his former Department on in the lines of the legislation of 1871. That legislation, and the Act of 1873, and part of that of last Session, had not worked well; but, on the contrary, meant interference with shipping in a form destructive to our trade, and the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) was at the present moment, at some of the seaports, the most unpopular man in England, for reasons which were properly attributable to that meddlesome and harassing Board of Trade legislation, with which the hon. Member for Derby had had very little to do, and to much of which he was opposed. He (Mr. Mac Iver) hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade would consider the objections which he took to the clause inserted by the Lords with reference to foreign shipping, and would also restore the clause relating to compensation for wrongful detention to the form in which it left the Commons; but, indeed, it would be much better to leave the whole subject of shipping legislation over until next Session, when it might reasonably be hoped that there could be some final settlement. The matter was now becoming better understood, and he (Mr. Mac Iver) maintained, and had always maintained, that the causes of preventable disaster at sea were few in number and might be easily dealt with in a much less cumbrous measure than that which was now before the House. Overloading and grossly improper loading were, no doubt, already practically stopped, although at the cost of needless annoyances and uncertainties; but without a better system of survey than was provided by this Bill unsafe ships would still go to sea, while, on the other hand, respectable shipowners would continue to have seaworthy property liable to unreasonable interference, with but small hope of obtaining compensation from the Board of Trade. The whole tendency of these survey clauses as they stood in the Bill was to undermine the legitimate authority of the shipmaster by placing him in the power of his crew whenever a fourth of them chose to be refractory. This was, he (Mr. Mac Iver) considered, a grave mistake, when it was remembered so many preventable disasters arose from faults of the crew rather than of the ship, and for these and other reasons he moved the rejection of the Bill, believing that it would be better to reconsider the whole subject next Session than to pass an unsatisfactory measure now. The hon. Gentleman concluded by formally moving the rejection of the Bill.

Captain PIM seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Mac Iver.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he did not think the hon. Member had adopted a wise course in again raising the question of the principle involved in the Bill. He had in season and out of season, at all stages of the Bill, treated the House to the self-same observations which he had that day repeated. He did not think that the course taken by the Upper House with respect to the Bill had been either wise or convenient. The Bill had been discussed in the House of Commons at great length for nearly 13 days, and the Government themselves acknowledged the great advantages which had been derived from the full discussion that took place; but in the other House, in the course of a very few minutes, some very large and important Amendments had been introduced, and, indeed, it had been a matter of boast at a recent City banquet, that a measure which took up many days in the House of Commons had been disposed of in less than half an hour in "another place." No doubt great advantages were to be derived from the revision in "another place" of the work of that House; but in the present instance the Government appeared to have taken advantage of their enormous majority in the House of Lords to register the preconceived opinions of the Board of Trade, and override the decision of the Commons. Nor was that all. The Bill was returned to them with these important Amendments almost on the last day of the Session, when nothing could be done to alter them. He did not think the hon. Member for Birkenhead had any chance of carrying his Amendment; but he joined with him in protesting against the course which had been pursued by the Government. He believed that such a course was not in the interests of the other House, or at all calculated to maintain its dignity and reputation, and must tend unfairly to prejudice an important question.

Mr. BENTINCK expressed his approval that the hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Mac Iver) had brought forward his Motion, because it enabled the House to deal with the whole principle of the Bill and not merely with the Lords' Amendments. A grave responsibility attached to the Government for having deferred this important measure to so late a period; and the Bill was so full of anomalies and objections that he thought it would be best to postpone the further consideration of the subject until another Session. The portion of the measure relating to deck-loads was so imperfect that it was impossible it could be worked. Deck-loads were altogether wrong in principle, but the only deck-loads prohibited by the Bill were those of timber, which constituted the safest deck-load a vessel could carry, and the effect of the clause would only be to increase the number of such loads. The greatest failure in the Bill was its vain attempt to deal with the loss of life at sea, which was the main object for which the measure was introduced. While proposing to deal with unseaworthy ships, all the principal causes of the loss of life at sea were left untouched by this Bill. The loss of life from unseaworthy ships was infinitesimal. A much larger number of fatalities arose from bad seamen and bad seamanship than from bad ships. Another cause of losses at sea was want of discipline, and yet the whole tendency of our legislation for years past had been to tamper with and decrease the discipline of our Mercantile Marine. Many ships were lost not from over-loading, but from being under-ballasted; and if the over-loading of ships was dealt with by legislation, cases of under-ballasting ought also to be dealt with. Collisions were the chief cause of loss of life at sea, and they were attributable to the confusion and complications in the wording of what was termed the Rule of the Road; and yet the Bill of the Government had no reference to this important subject. Fire, frequently caused or assisted by want of discipline or control of the crew, was not dealt with by the Bill. Numerous cases of losses of vessels were attributable to the form in which they were built, and the Bill was silent also upon this subject. His conviction was that the Bill was so vexatious in its character, and so injurious to the interests of the Mercantile Marine, that its provisions would never be acquiesced in, and the shipping interest would be driven to force upon the Government further legislation. He acknowledged the ability displayed by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade in conducting this Bill; but the fact was that he had been placed in a false position, because the Board of Trade, as at present constituted, was not a tribunal competent to deal with this subject. He trusted that Parliament would see the necessity of constituting a competent tribunal, composed of sailors and other persons conversant with the interests of the Mercantile Marine, to deal with this matter, which was the most important question of the day.

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY thought that the House would prefer proceeding to the consideration of the Lords' Amendments instead of entering afresh upon a discussion involving the whole merits of the Bill. The hon. Member for Birkenhead, who wished them to throw over this Bill which had occupied so much of the Session, did not seem to be aware that the effect of his proposal would be to allow the temporary Act now in existence to expire, and leave the country for 12 months without any law on this particular subject. This was a most unreasonable proposal, and he did not think the House would be willing to try such an experiment. The hon. Member did not encourage them with any idea that he had any better measure to substitute for the Act of last Session, or for the Bill before the House, of which, indeed, he said he generally approved. As to the remarks of the hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), they were somewhat disrespectful to the House of Lords, who had very amply discussed the Bill on its second reading, and had had the benefit of the discussions in this House before they dealt with the measure in Committee. After ample time for reflection they produced a certain number of Amendments, which, though numerous in appearance, were chiefly verbal Amendments, except only on three points. As this was the first subject brought before the House in the present Session, the hon. Member for West Norfolk (Mr. Bentinck) had no just cause for complaint, and by discussing the whole measure over again he had now made it the Alpha and Omega of the Session. In referring to various subjects not within the scope of the Bill the hon. Member had given himself so much latitude and licence that if his example were followed by the rest of the House, they might occupy the remainder of the year in this discussion. He must, however, at this period decline to enter into the general merits of the Bill, and trusted the House would proceed at once to consider the Lords' Amendments.

Mr. NORWOOD felt bound to express a strong opinion as to the inconvenient and almost improper conduct of the Government with reference to this measure. When it left that House there was an understanding that a compromise had been effected which would not be disturbed. Yet, in "another place," Amendments covering six pages had, with one exception, been introduced by the Government and accepted *en bloc* without discussion, the utmost time given to the consideration of the Bill being 45 minutes. The measure having been suddenly changed in this manner was brought back at the fag-end of the Session. This was neither a proper mode of dealing with the large interests involved, nor a respectful manner of treating the House. If it was to form a precedent it would be of no use for hon. Members to expend time and trouble in the minute discussion of measures in that House, when the Government could, by a simple manœuvre, get their own provisions inserted in "another place," and by deferring their consideration to the last day of the Session set at nought the deliberate conclusions of the House of Commons.

Mr. GORST joined in the protest of the hon. Member against the position in which the House had been placed at this period of the Session with reference to this Bill. The Amendments in question had not been made by the House of Lords properly speaking, or even by the Government, but by the officials of the Board of Trade. The conclusion come to by that House had been submitted to the permanent officials in that Department, and they had chosen to reverse in many respects the opinion of that House, and the Government had asked the House of Lords to register those decisions. He would not incur the responsibility of wrecking the whole Bill because he disapproved of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in submitting these Amendments at the end of the Session. He thought it would be better to let the Bill pass under protest; but he desired that it should be understood that it was not the Bill of the House of Commons but of Her Majesty's Government, and that it should be considered to remain open for Parliament to re-consider the question next Session. He should not vote for the Motion of the hon. Member for Birkenhead, but would accept these Amendments in silence, throwing the responsibility of this mercantile legislation upon the Government.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER expressed a hope that unless it was the intention of the House to reject the Bill they would proceed with the discussion of the Amendments. The hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) complained that the House had not been treated properly, but that was an erroneous view of the matter. He did not say that many of these Amendments were not made in the House of Lords; but that might fairly be considered a matter of convenience. Three important Amendments had been made—those with regard to deck-loading, costs, and foreign shipping. The last-named was introduced by a private Member of the House of Lords. The deck-loading Amendment was not in the original Bill as introduced by the Government, and it had been brought forward in the Upper House in consequence of representations made in the colonial interest by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, who had been in communication with Canada on the subject. The question of costs was one upon which the House of Lords was well qualified to form an opinion, and he had himself stated in the House of Commons that it would probably be a question which their Lordships would have to deal with. It was not the case that the Amendments were those of the permanent officials of the Board of Trade. There had been no disrespect to the House of Commons, and he trusted that hon. Members would proceed at once with the discussion.

MR. T. E. SMITH said, the shipowning interest had not been treated in either a very considerate or courteous manner in reference to these Amendments. He protested against the doctrine that it would be no serious evil if the Bill did not pass this Session. He hoped that this was merely a formal Motion, and that it would not be carried to a division. One important Amendment had not been alluded to, and that was that the whole of the coasting trade of the country was exempted from the load-line.

MR. E. J. REED asked why, if these Amendments were necessary, they had not been made earlier. Hon. Members had sat there night after night to discuss this Bill on the profession of the Government that it was necessary to obtain a settlement of this great question; but the Bill went to the House of Lords, and in a few minutes the decision of the Lower House was set aside. The question was whether it was worth while for that House to discuss the question when their decisions were set aside in such fashion?

MR. GOURLEY said, that the practical effect of the Bill would be to place the jurisdiction over shipping in the hands of the Board of Trade. He held it to be most unfair to throw the discussion of this question into the last hours of the Session.

MR. PLIMSOLL concurred in the observations of the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst). The Amendments in the House of Lords were received from the hands of the Duke of Richmond and Gordon *en bloc*, and it was stated that in 25 minutes these proposals were disposed of upon a mere fragmentary discussion. In the Act which previously existed the vessels in the coasting trade, and those trading to the Elbe and Brest, were rendered subject to the load-line, excepting in the case of such small coasting vessels as were navigated chiefly by the owners and their families. This was altered in the House of Lords, probably at the instance of the Board of Trade. In a House of Commons of 400 Members, after full discussion as to deck-loading, and after its being resisted by the Government, the Committee decided that deck-loading should be abolished, and it was decided to go back to the state of the law which existed before 1862. But that was altered by the House of Lords. If the opinion of Canada had such weight with Her Majesty's Government, why did they overrule it in the matter of grain cargoes? The Board of Trade, anxious to retain authority over a subject they did not understand, pulled with Canada when she was for laxity, but not when she asked for good legislation. He objected to a Government admonition to be brief and come to business after that business had been purposely postponed to the last moment to prevent any discussion on these Amendments in the House of Commons. He asked the House to imagine his feelings when last night, one after another, Members came to him and said—"Good-bye, Plimsoll, we should have been glad to have helped you, but it is too late now; there is nothing for it but to take what the Government will give you;" and yet the House of Commons at its last sitting had been wasting hour after hour in discussing whether persons who were to operate upon frogs should secure the certificate of the Secretary of State. He thought the conduct of the Government in this matter had been disgraceful, and nothing less. He believed it was with design that this Bill had been altered and kept back from the consideration of the House until it would be rendered impossible to reverse the decisions of the Government. He did not even think that it was the Government; he believed it was simply the brother-in-law of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Farrer, of the Board of Trade, who was responsible for the Amendments. The Bill the House was asked to pass was his Bill and nothing else.

He thought they should put away feeling, and pass the Bill simply because they could not help themselves. He was of opinion that they had better not go through the farce of discussing the matter in a House in which the Government and the shipowners could do what they liked. He ought hardly to have classed the shipowners with the Government, for he had a thousand times rather trust a committee of shipowners, if ample powers were given to them, than the Board of Trade. The only thing seemed to be to allow the Bill to pass, and to let the whole matter stand over for discussion till next year.

Mr. MAC IVER expressed his readiness to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Lords Amendments *considered.*

Amendments, as far as the Amendment in page 5, line 27, *agreed to.*

Captain PIM, who had given Notice of a Motion to disagree to the Lords' Amendment in page 2, line 6, which inserts the words "or of the Governor of the British Possession in which such prosecution takes place," said, he would not press it, but content himself with the protest already made against the alterations effected in the measure by the other House.

Page 5, line 27, leave out from "that," to the second "the," in line 28, and insert

"there was not reasonable and probable cause by reason of the condition of the ship or the act or default of the owner for the provisional detention of the ship,"

the next Amendment, read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Sir Charles Adderley.*)

Mr. T. E. SMITH said, this was one of the three important Amendments which the Lords had made in the Bill; and he was surprised, after the discussion the matter had undergone in this House, that the Government had thought proper to make so serious an alteration in the clause in the summary manner they had done in "another place." It might be said that alteration was due to the great legal attainments of Members of the other House; but he maintained that that was not a legal question nor a question of mere detail, or of machinery, but one of substance—namely, whether certain heavy penalties should fall on a particular class of Her Majesty's subjects or no. The existing principle of the law was that costs should follow the verdict; but the Government now proposed to depart from that principle—he could not understand why. It was hard on the shipowner that he should be subject to have his ship detained for survey, involving considerable expense, without due cause, and that he should be left to bear all the loss and responsibility himself, as would be the practical effect of adopting that Amendment. When a ship had, in fact, been improperly detained it would be easy for a Government Department to find some insignificant blemish or defect in the vessel, not really detracting from her seaworthiness, which might be held to have been "a reasonable or probable cause" for detaining her. The shipowner maintained that if the Board of Trade made a mistake by detaining a ship which was not unsafe within the meaning of the Act he should be entitled to compensation at the hands of the country for a detention not arising from his fault, but from motives of public policy. And not only was the Board of Trade not to be liable in such a case, but other persons who made rash and unfounded affidavits leading the Board to detain a vessel without good cause were also to be exempt from responsibility. He hoped the Government would therefore re-consider that matter and not accede to the Lords' Amendment. It was hopeless now to obtain a full consideration of the question, and he trusted that the Government would meet the shipowners in a conciliatory spirit, and not carry these Amendments by the tyranny of a majority with which private Members were unable to cope. He moved that the House do not agree to the Lords' Amendment on Clause 10.

Mr. SPEAKER said, the Question was that the House do agree with the Lords' Amendment. The hon. Member could not move an Amendment, but might negative the Motion when the Question was put.

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY could assure the hon. Member that he should not ask the House to agree to the Lords' Amendments if they were contrary to his own convictions. When this particular clause left the House there was a general expectation that it would be dealt with by the House of Lords. It was so expressly left to be dealt with, a previous Amendment having left the Bill inconsistent, and by the highest legal authority it had been reduced to consistency, and, as he thought, with the best results. Although he had defended the principle of costs following conviction when the Bill was before this House, he regarded the Lords' Amendment as more correctly adjusting that principle to all possible cases. If the House accepted the Amendment, the law would then be that the Board of Trade would have to show a reasonable cause for detaining a vessel. If it was shown that the Board of Trade had proceeded without reasonable cause, then the Government would have to pay, and if the proceedings were taken on a frivolous complaint the Board of Trade could recover from the complainants. In the third possible contingency, of reasonable cause for detention having been shown and of the ship being, notwithstanding, acquitted, then the costs would be divided. Regarding the clause as it now stood as preferable to the clause as it left this House, he trusted the House would agree to the Lords' Amendment.

Mr. NORWOOD must remind the President of the Board of Trade that the clause as it left that House was moved by the right hon. Gentleman himself, and with that clause the shipowners were perfectly content. It was true something was said about leaving the question for the other House; but he (Mr. Norwood) had thereupon protested against the matter being left to be decided by the House of Lords. The House divided, and the clause was carried by a majority of 54. The other House had, however, rejected a provision carried, after discussion, by a large majority in that House and proposed by the President of the Board of Trade himself. The Legislature was asked to give these enormous powers to the Board of Trade to be carried into effect not by their direct action, but by appointing officers all over the Kingdom to detain vessels. An ignorant man might say that a vessel should not go to sea until he had communicated with the Board of Trade. That intelligence would no doubt be telegraphed to Lloyd's, the underwriters would take fright, and an injury would be done to the character of the ship and the credit of the shipowner which it would take years to remove. If this clause were passed as now amended, there would be no redress for any shipowners whose vessel might be detained, and he appealed with confidence to the House to alter the clause.

Mr. PLIMSOLL said, he hoped this discussion would show the impolicy of allowing any ships to be stopped by the Board of Trade on their own motion. The difficulty would have been avoided if the Government had insisted upon all unclassed vessels being periodically surveyed.

Mr. D. JENKINS complained of the manner in which surveys were made.

Mr. MAC IVER protested against the manner in which the clause had been altered at a period of the Session when it was impossible properly to consider the Lords' Amendment.

Mr. GOURLEY hoped that the Government would re-consider this clause, as it would in its present shape work with hardship to shipowners.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE pointed out that the Government had changed their minds between this House and the House of Lords. They had proposed the clause in one form in this House, and had in the other introduced very material alterations into it. He agreed that if the clause passed as amended the shipowner would be practically without remedy.

Sir ANDREW LUSK sympathized with the shipowners as much as any one, but he looked upon the adoption of the words "reasonable and proper cause" as the only way out of the difficulty. He thought the House of Lords were right. Indeed, they were often right, and that House was wrong.

Mr. H. T. COLE doubted whether, under the clause as it now stood, the shipowner would ever be able to recover at all.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL observed, that a jury would find no difficulty in coming to a conclusion whether there was reasonable or probable cause for the detention of a ship, and the disposition of a jury would be in favour of a shipowner whose ship had been detained, and was, as it turned out, not an unsafe ship. The great object of the Bill was the prevention of sending unseaworthy ships to sea, and it would throw a great obstacle in the way of the Board of Trade in their efforts to carry out that object if they were to be saddled, in such cases as those referred to, with costs.

Mr. HENLEY thought the Amendment would probably cause the Act to become a dead letter, and that there would be an enormous amount of litigation under it. He thought it would be far better to leave the clause as it formerly was.

Mr. BATES hoped the Government would withdraw the Lords' Amendment, which would never work satisfactorily.

Mr. GORST was in favour of the clause as it had been settled, after full discussion in the House of Commons, and trusted the Lords' Amendment would not be pressed.

Mr. BULWER pointed out that without the Lords' Amendment the Bill would practically be a dead letter, as no one could be expected to incur the risk he would run by detaining a ship which he had reasonable cause to believe was unseaworthy, and which might prove to be seaworthy. In the case which had been alluded to, of an action of false imprisonment, if the defendant succeeded in showing reasonable and probable cause for his proceedings, the plaintiff failed altogether, and had to pay not only his own costs, but the costs of the defendant also. The shipowner who failed in his proceedings against the Board of Trade would not be in so unfavourable a position, as he would only have to pay his own costs. To make the Board pay the costs of both sides, when there was reasonable and probable cause for the detention of the ship, would be most unjust. It would be to mulct them in costs for having acted as reasonable men, to the same extent as if they had acted without any reason at all. He should support the Amendments which had been made by the other House.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, unless some protection was given to the Government as it was by the Amendment of the Lords', the Government officers would hardly be justified in taking proceedings against any ship. The Amendment was a fair and reasonable compromise.

The Attorney General

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 68; Noes 37: Majority 31.

Amendments, as far as the Amendment in page 8, line 37, *agreed to.*

Page 8, line 37, leave out the last paragraph of Clause 13, and insert

"Where the survey of a ship is made for the purpose of a declaration or certificate under the above recited enactments, the person appointed to make the survey shall, if so required by the owner, be accompanied on the survey by some person appointed by the owner, and in such case, if the said two persons agree, there shall be no appeal to the court of survey in pursuance of this section,"

the next Amendment, read a second time.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "owner," in line 5, to the end of the Lords Amendment, in order to insert the words "and by a third person, to be named in such manner and on such conditions as the Board of Trade from time to time prescribe (whether by general regulations or in the particular case); and, if such two last-mentioned persons agree, their report shall have the same effect as if it were a report made on appeal by a court of survey under this section," —(*Mr. Norwood,*)

—instead thereof.

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY objected to the Amendment of the hon. Member, which would place the shipowner in a worse position than that in which he would stand under the provisions of the Bill.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Lords Amendment," put, and *agreed to.*

Lords Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendments as far as the Amendment "after Clause 17 insert Clause (A)," *agreed to.*

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY moved that the House agree with a new clause inserted by the House of Lords, after Clause 17, in order to provide that, as far as the question of survey was concerned, foreign passenger ships calling at English ports should be placed under the conditions which applied to English ships calling at foreign ports. The only desire on the part of the Board of Trade was that perfect reciprocity should be established.

"After Clause 17, insert Clause (A)" Provision as to survey of foreign passenger steamer or emigrant ship), read a second time, and amended.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment, as amended."—(*Sir Charles Adderley.*)

MR. T. E. SMITH moved that the House disagree with the clause.

MR. BATES pointed out that this proviso had been agreed to by the right hon. Gentleman at the instance of one man in all England, the agent of foreign boats, and he would recommend that for the present the whole clause should be left out of the Bill.

MR. GOURLEY feared that the effect of the clause would be to throw the passenger trade into the hands of foreigners.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER pointed out that various clauses relating to foreign ships having been introduced into the Bill, it had been thought reasonable to concede this demand on their part.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 49; Noes 36: Majority 13.

Amendments, as far as the Amendment "Pages 11 and 12, leave out Clause 21 and insert Clause (C)," *agreed to*, with an Amendment to the Lords Amendment in page 11, line 3.

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY, in moving that the House agree to Clause C, which allowed, deals, battens, or other light wood to be carried on deck to a height not exceeding three feet, stated that the Government had decided to introduce this modification into the Bill in order that the legislation of this country might harmonize with that of Canada, and also because remonstrances had been received from foreign Powers against the absolute prohibition of all deck-loads. He believed that deck-loads of the kind allowed in the Bill would not be dangerous, and that there was no sufficient reason for prohibiting them.

"Pages 11 and 12, leave out Clause 21, and insert Clause (C) (Penalty for carrying deck loads of timber in winter)," read a second time.

On the Motion of Mr. PLIMSOLL, the clause was amended so as to come into operation in November, instead of January next.

MR. PLIMSOLL moved to leave out the words, "to a height exceeding three feet above the deck," in order to prevent any deck cargoes being carried on deck at all. The hon. Member said, he intended next Session to ask for an inquiry into the circumstances under which in 1862, the Board of Trade repealed the previous legislation on this subject. He understood the provision had been introduced in the interest of about 100 Canadian ships which had been specially built for the carrying of deck cargoes. This deck-loading had caused horrors of a most dreadful description, which, were, indeed, going on now. A committee of Lloyd's had investigated the circumstances attending the voyage of deck-laden timber ships during the time when it was prohibited. Between 1850 and 1859 the committee found that 3,774 ships sailed from Quebec to this country, and in the 10 years following there were 3,068 ships sailed. The particulars of all these voyages had been examined, and it had been found that the deck-loading period—that was, from 1863 to 1872 inclusive—was marked by a loss of life nearly four times as great as the period during which no deck-loads were allowed. He thought it greatly to the honour of Canada, as showing the humanity of her people, that before we moved decisively in the matter, she had legislated so thoroughly to prevent shipping losses.

Amendment proposed, in sub-section (c) of the Clause, to leave out the words "to a height exceeding three feet above the deck."—(*Mr. Plimsoll.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Lords Amendment."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 55; Noes 29: Majority 26.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment, as amended."—(*Sir Charles Adderley.*)

MR. NORWOOD protested strongly against the clause, because it sanctioned the loading of 3 feet of deals and battens on the deck of a ship in winter, thereby directly recognizing deck loading, which was without precedent in our legislation. He thought British shipowners were entitled to complain of the tyrannical provisions of the Bill. The wise plan would have been not to legislate with such precision on deck cargoes at all, leaving a margin for the exercise of discretion by surveyors on each individual case. It was absurd to apply the same regulation in the case of a six weeks' voyage from Canada as in the case of a six days' voyage from Norway. He moved that the House disagree with the Lords Amendment.

Mr. D. JENKINS also protested against the clause, which, he trusted, would be rescinded next Session. Deck-loading in winter ought to be wholly abolished as dangerous. A hard-and-fast line of 3 feet was absurd, because every seaman knew that some ships were much safer with 4 feet than others were with 2 feet of deck-load.

Mr. WHITWELL hoped the Government would retrace steps which they had so recently taken on this question.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 49; Noes 26: Majority 23.

"Page 12, line 24, leave out 'under eighty tons register,'" read a second time."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Sir Charles Adderley.*)

Mr. T. E. SMITH had given Notice of a Motion to disagree from the Lords' Amendment in Clause 22, excluding vessels in the coasting trade from the operation of the clause as to load-line; but he refrained from proposing it because the Government had not shown any desire to meet the views of those who differed from them, and they had obtained their majorities by the votes of their Supporters, who had not heard the arguments used on both sides.

Mr. PLIMSOLL said, he had the same Amendment on the Paper as the hon. Member for Tynemouth (Mr. T. E. Smith), and he intended to take a division upon it. He, therefore, moved that the House disagree from the Lords' Amendment in page 12, line 24, and lines 38 and 39 in Clause 22. It was agreed by the Government that it was desirable to bring vessels above a certain tonnage in the coasting trade under the same regulations as those in the foreign trade. He should like to have a load-line fixed by independent authorities. He regarded this as an Amendment not so much of the House of Lords as of the Board of Trade.

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY said, that the load-line originally adopted was for foreign-going ships, but on the Motion of the hon. Member for Derby the regulation was made applicable to coasting vessels above 80 tons. He agreed that part of the coasting trade ought to be under some regulation of the kind proposed; but the clause was now drawn so as to be applicable only to foreign-going ships, and if the experiment should turn out well he would take steps for its extension.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER was willing to consider the matter as relating to the coasting trade, but it would be difficult, if not impossible, to arrange it now.

Mr. E. JENKINS moved the adjournment of the Debate.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he would consent to disagree from the Lords in the Amendment so far as it related to the coasting trade. Some consequential Amendment must be made, or the clause as it stood would be unintelligible.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *negatived.*

"Page 12, line 26, leave out 'all,'" the next Amendment, *agreed to.*

"Page 12, lines 38 and 39, leave out 'under eighty tons register,'" the next Amendment, *disagreed to.*

Subsequent Amendments *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:"—Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Bates, Mr. Plimsoll, Mr. Eustace Smith, and Sir William Edmonstone:—To withdraw immediately; Three to be the quorum.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL—[*Lords.*]—[BILL 221.]

(*Viscount Sandon.*)

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th August], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on the Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill.)

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. BARING (for Lord FRANCIS HERVEY) moved, "That this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee." The hon. Member complained that practically the House was placed in the position of being asked at the fag-end of a Saturday afternoon, and on the very last working day of the Session, to pass a Bill about which they had not heard a word of explanation. The measure was a very short one, no doubt, but it meant a good deal in its very few lines. It was a Bill to give the present School Board for London, whose term of office and official life would terminate in November next, compulsory powers to purchase 56 pieces of land, containing altogether 762,000 square feet, or 17½ acres, all in London. In November there would come into office a new School Board, to whom one would think that such a duty as that which would be entailed by the Bill would be much more naturally left. He had several personal friends on the Board, and he thought, when the House was able to take a reasonable view of the work the London School Board had done, and when they considered their difficult circumstances, they would admit that this first School Board had done difficult work and done it well. There was one fault he had to find with them, however, and that was that they had been a little extravagant. But it was not until we had built our first house that we learnt how to build economically. It might fairly be expected from another School Board that they would avoid all the extravagances—all the well-meaning extravagances—the present Board had been led into. It might be that the new School Board would seek for similar powers to those now asked for, and if they did he did not think that Parliament could offer much objection. He objected to the measure because it tied the hands of the new School Board absolutely, and would oblige them to carry out operations of a very large and expensive character. That was neither fair to the Board nor to the ratepayers of London. Most of the sites in question were removed from the centre of London, although they were in the metropolitan district. But there were many scattered through St. Pancras, Marylebone, Holborn, Finsbury, and other parts, and the expense of acquiring them would be very great indeed. He objected to the passing of a measure of this kind, when the House was reduced to its present state of empty benches, by the numerical strength of the official supporters of the Government. He should have been willing to make some compromise on the subject, but he understood there could be no compromise. He should be quite willing to consent to the present School Board going on with the sites which they had acquired, and which were not entirely new; and if the Bill went into Committee he should move that a course of that kind be adopted. But he felt assured that the Bill could pass as well next Session as now. What would be said by the supporters of the Bill he did not know; but he supposed it would be said that the measure must be allowed to pass because some Government officials had agreed to it. Well, he had perfect confidence in the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council; but he could not place implicit confidence in all the officials of a Government Department, and he thought they had a right to ask the Government not to press such a Bill as this in a House which had neither the time, the knowledge, nor the inclination to debate it at the length it deserved.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee," — (*Mr. Baring,*) — instead thereof.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was in favour of the measure, and believed it would be carried by a majority of the House. The hon. Member had said that there had been no time to scrutinize the Bill, but he would remind him that it had been scrutinized by the elected representatives of the ratepayers of London, and the Vice President of the Council's connection with it was purely an official one. When the hon. Member argued that the Bill should not be carried because there would be a new School Board next November, he should recollect that one School Board carried on the work of its predecessors. Would the hon. Gentleman contend that the House ought never to pass a Bill relating to a borough because a new Town Council would be elected in November next. It would be a very grievous mistake if the Bill were not allowed to pass. True, the London School Board had been a little extravagant; but that fact should not be allowed to interfere with the purchase of sites of this kind. A great hardship would be done to the Metropolis if this measure were not allowed to pass.

Viscount SANDON pointed out that the second reading had been carried without a discussion, but that was an accident, which had been explained, and was one which the Government had very much regretted. The Government had been anxious to push the matter on further; but the hon. Member's Amendment had kept watch over the Bill, and at late hours when it had come on the Government had been unable, in consequence, to make progress with it. Again, the lamentable illness of the noble Lord (Lord Francis Hervey) had made them anxious not to press the Bill on one or two occasions when it might have been discussed and passed. It might be well to mention what had taken place in the Education Department respecting the sites scheduled in this Bill. The London School Board sent the usual Notice to the Education Department that they proposed to take certain sites for schools, for which they required compulsory powers. The Education Department thereupon sent an Inspector, who went over the ground and reported to the Lord President and Vice President of the Council the results of his survey. Meanwhile notice was given in the locality, that any objections could be made to the Education Department. Ultimately, the Lord President went into the cases of every one of the sites proposed, and the good ones were accepted and the bad ones rejected. As a matter of fact, he believed he might say, that all the cases to which local objections were made to the Department, were in this instance, rejected. The eligiblity of these sites had, therefore, been well sifted by the representatives of the ratepayers and by Her Majesty's Government. As to the numbers of these sites, the fact was that the London School Board were not providing accommodation for nearly the number of children for whom they ought to build, so that if the House refused to pass the Bill the Education Department would be placed in a very perplexing position as regarded the School Board. If the Board, through the rejection of this measure, failed to provide for the proper number of children, it would be the duty of the Department to send them a requisition calling upon them to build for possibly two or three times the number of schools contained in this Schedule. Neither the London School Board nor the voluntary schools had hitherto met the deficiency of school accommodation, so that next year, unless the present measure passed, the Department would have to tell the London School Board, "You must build more schools," and their answer would then be that Parliament had refused to sanction their sites; and yet the Department would be bound, under the Act, to order them to build for all the children needing school accommodation, under pain of being declared in default. He entreated the hon. Member for South Essex to remember this, and also to consider that the passing of his Amendment would amount to a vote of censure upon the London School Board. He, for one, should be exceedingly reluctant to see any action of this nature taken by the House just before the School Board elections were coming on. In the interest, therefore, of the children of London, the Education Department, and the School Board of London, he trusted that, after this explanation, which was most naturally desired by his hon. Friends, the Bill which had received the full and deliberate sanction of the Government would now be allowed to pass through Committee.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT said, he had intended to move an Amendment which, amongst other things, asked for information. A great part of the information he sought had been given. His contention had been that the new Board, which was to be elected in November, ought not to be fettered by the action of the expiring Board. He thought there might with advantage be omitted from the Bill the names of the five schools which would cost £20,000 each, and he suggested that cheaper sites should be purchased for the future. But after the explanations which had been given he would not put the House to the trouble of a Division.

Mr. CHARLEY condemned the Bill as being entirely at variance with the principles which Conservative Members supported, and moved the Adjournment of the Debate on the ground that the measure had slipped through the second reading by accident.

[The Motion was not seconded.]

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported*, without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

IRISH PEERAGE BILL. [*Lords.*]

[Bill 149.] (*Mr. Gibson.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On Question, "That the Preamble be postponed?"

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA moved that the Chairman report Progress and ask leave to sit again. The reasons which induced him to make that Motion were these. The Bill upon which they had as yet had no discussion whatever was a Bill to amend the law concerning the Peerage of Ireland, and it also proposed to repeal one important clause of the Act of Union. His objection to its being now proceeded with was this—that it was one of the most serious Acts the Legislature could undertake, and there was not time for this House to consider it. It professed on the face of it to be introduced with the sanction of both Houses of the Legislature; but it was based on an Address to the Crown voted by the other House of Parliament only, praying that Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to place at the disposal of Parliament that portion of her Prerogative and power which enabled her to create Irish Peerages now and in the future.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present,—Committee counted, and 40 Members not being present,

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:—House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at Seven o'clock till Monday.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 14*th August*, 1876.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading—Committee negatived—Third Reading*—Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland)* (235); Norwich and Boston Corrupt Voters* (234); Pensions Commutation Act Amendment* (236).

Third Reading—Bow Street Police Court (Site)* (228); Expiring Laws Continuance* (229); Sheriff Courts (Scotland)* (222); Legal Practitioners* (220); Suez Canal (Shares)* (221); War Department and Post Office (Remuneration, &c.)* (219); Consolidated Fund (Appriation),* and *passed.*

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL.

CONSIDERATION OF COMMONS AMENDMENTS TO LORDS AMENDMENTS.

Commons Amendments to Lords Amendments, and Commons Reason for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to Order).

Amendments and Reason read as follows:—

"Page 12. In Clause (A.) added by the Lords, line 4, after ("satisfied") insert ("by the production of a foreign certificate of survey attested by a British consular officer at the port of survey").

"Line 5. After ("and") insert ("are satisfied") and at the end of the clause insert ("provided that Her Majesty may by Order in Council direct that this section shall not apply in the case of an official survey at any foreign port at which it appears to Her Majesty that corresponding provisions are not extended to British ships").

"Page 13. Line 5. The Commons propose to restore the word ("such") omitted by the Lords.

"Page 14. In Clause (C.) added by the Lords, line 1. the Commons propose to leave out ("January") and insert ("November"), and in line 2, to leave out ("seventy-seven") and insert ("seventy-six").

"The Commons disagree to the omission of the words ("under eighty tons register") in page 12. line 24. and lines 38. and 39.

> "Because it is desirable that the provisions relating to deck and load lines should be made applicable to coasting vessels above eighty tons."

Amendments *agreed to.*

Moved, "Not to insist on the Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*The Lord President.*)

Question put, Whether to insist on the said Amendments?

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Moved, "In lieu thereof to insert the following Clause as a consequential Amendment after Clause 23:—

"With respect to the marking of a load line on British ships employed in the coasting trade, the following provisions shall have effect:

"(1.) The owner of every British ship employed in the coasting trade on the coasts of the United Kingdom (except ships under eighty tons register employed solely in that trade) shall, before proceeding to sea from any port, mark upon each of her sides amidships, or as near thereto as is practicable, in white or yellow on a dark ground, or in black on a light ground, a circular disc, twelve inches in diameter, with a horizontal line eighteen inches in length drawn through its centre:

"(2.) The centre of this disc shall indicate the maximum load-line in salt water to which the owner intends to load the ship until notice is given of an alteration:

"(3.) He shall also, once in every twelve months, immediately before the ship proceeds to sea, send or deliver to the collector or other principal officer of customs of the port of registry of the ship, a statement in writing of the distance in feet and inches between the centre of the disc and the upper edge of each of the lines indicating the position of the ship's decks which is above that centre:

"(4.) The owner, before the ship proceeds to sea after any renewal or alteration of the disc, shall send or deliver to the collector or other principal officer of customs of the port of registry of the ship notice in writing of such renewal or alteration, together with such statement in writing as before mentioned of the distance between the centre of the disc and the upper edge of each of the deck lines:

"(5.) If default is made in sending or delivering any notice or statement required by this section to be sent or delivered, the owner shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred pounds:

"(6.) When a ship has been marked as by this section required, she shall be kept so marked until notice is given of an alteration."—(*The Lord President.*)

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative.*

Message sent to the House of Commons, To acquaint them, That the Lords do not insist upon their Amendments to which the Commons disagree, and agree to the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords to the said Bill, with a consequential Amendment, to which they desire the concurrence of the Commons.

COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH ROUMANIA.—QUESTION.

Lord CAMPBELL rose to ask, Whether a document which has recently appeared in *The Morning Post* as a letter from the Foreign Office to the Secretary of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce is authentic? The noble Lord said: The letter must have appeared in the first week of August, but I am not sure on what day as it was communicated to me in an extract. It is dated July 29th, signed Julian Pauncefote. Its substance is, if I interpret it correctly, that the Foreign Office are prepared to negotiate directly a Commercial Treaty with Roumania, in imitation of the Austrian example, of which so much was heard last Session. After the opinions I have ventured to express upon the subject, it was not possible for me to pass the statement perfectly unquestioned. But I did not wish unguardedly or hastily to assume it to be genuine, as it has not appeared in any Papers given to the House. The Question is intended rather to elicit facts than to convey oblique or premature reflection on the conduct of the Foreign Office. Although the letter has some marks of authenticity, it seems improbable on the face of it that the Foreign Office should decidedly abandon the ground on which they stood last year; even in deference to a commercial body whose importance is admitted. It seems to be improbable that even if a market was endangered some better method of retaining it would not have been arrived at. Even if a prohibitory duty was impending from

Roumania, one would think the diplomatic mind might reach a better counter project than capitulation on a principle so recently maintained as indispensable to Treaties. One could not readily assume that with the talents and resources which the Foreign Office is well known to possess, on a point so grave, a vassal Principality should be able to checkmate them by any menace it resorted to. I therefore framed the Question in the way in which I put it.

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, I need hardly say, in answer to the Question, that the document to which the noble Lord refers is authentic and accurate in its terms. With regard to the question of policy which has been raised, if the noble Lord had been acquainted with all the facts of the case I do not think he would have taken the view which he appears to take. He has spoken of a reversal of our former policy on the question, but there really has been nothing of the kind. What has happened is this—When the discussion occurred on the subject of a Commercial Treaty with Roumania last year, I said all along that upon grounds of policy I had no objection to the negotiation of such a Treaty, but that our sole objection was that, according to our view of the construction placed upon existing Treaty arrangements, the Porte had a right to object, and therefore such a Treaty ought not to be concluded without the consent of the Porte; and I say the same now. If the Porte is willing, however, to give way, I see now, as I saw then, in point of policy no reason why it should not do so, nor do I think that any injury would accrue to the Turkish Empire in consequence. Communications have passed on the subject, and the result is that while, from considerations which I need not enter into, the Porte is unwilling to make any formal or official change in the relations between it and Roumania, yet, seeing the difficulties of the case, and having been either unable or unwilling to prevent other Powers from negotiating such Treaties, the Porte has waived the objections which it entertained, and we understand that no impediment will be raised on its part to the conclusion of a Treaty of this kind. That removes the only obstacles which stood in the way, and, therefore, negotiations are going on.

JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THIS HOUSE.

ORDER.

Moved by the LORD CHANCELLOR—

"To resolve, That this House do meet on Tuesday the 21st of November next for the purpose of hearing and determining Appeals and Matters connected therewith, pursuant to the provisions of 'The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876.'"

Motion *agreed to,* and *ordered* accordingly.

JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THIS HOUSE.

STANDING ORDERS.

Moved by the LORD CHANCELLOR—

"To resolve, That the following Standing Orders do regulate all Appeals presented to the House on and after the 1st day of November 1876:

"STANDING ORDER I.

"Ordered, that, except where otherwise provided by Statute, no petition of appeal be received by this House unless the same be lodged in the Parliament Office for presentation to the House within one year from the date of the last decree, order, judgment, or interlocutor appealed from.

"In cases in which the person entitled to appeal be within the age of one and twenty years, or covert, non compos mentis, imprisoned, or out of Great Britain and Ireland, such person may be at liberty to present his appeal to the House, provided that the same be lodged in the Parliament Office within one year next after full age, discoverture, coming of sound mind, enlargement out of prison, or coming into Great Britain or Ireland: But in no case shall any person or persons be allowed a longer time, on account of mere absence, to present an appeal, than five years from the date of the last decree, order, judgment, or interlocutor appealed against.—[* *Applicable to all Decrees, &c. pronounced on and after the 1st day of November* 1876.]

"STANDING ORDER II.

"Ordered, that all petitions of appeal be signed, and the reasonableness thereof certified, by two counsel who shall have attended as counsel in the court below, or shall purpose attending as counsel at the hearing in this House.

"STANDING ORDER III.

"Ordered, that the 'order of service' issued upon the presentation of an appeal for service on the respondent or his solicitor, be returned to the Parliament Office, together with an affidavit of due service entered thereon, within the time limited for the appellant to lodge his printed cases, unless within that period all the Respondents shall have lodged their printed cases; in default, the appeal to stand dismissed.

"STANDING ORDER IV.

"Ordered, in all appeals that the Appellant or Appellants do give security to the Clerk of the Parliaments by recognizance to be entered into, in person or by substitute, to the Queen of the penalty of five hundred pounds, conditioned to pay to the Respondent or Respondents all such costs as may be ordered to be paid by the House in the matter of the appeal; and further, that the Appellant or Appellants do procure two sufficient sureties, to the satisfaction of the Clerk of the Parliaments, to enter into a joint and several bond to the amount of two hundred pounds, or do pay in to the account of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords the sum of two hundred pounds; such bond, or such sum of two hundred pounds, to be subject to the Order of the House with regard to the costs of the appeal: Ordered, that within one week after the presentation of the appeal the Appellant or Appellants do pay in to the account of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords the said sum of two hundred pounds, or submit to the Clerk of the Parliaments the names of the sureties proposed to enter into the said bond; and, in the event of a substitute being proposed to enter into the said recognizance, the name of such substitute; two clear days previous notice of the names so proposed for bond and recognizance to be given to the Solicitor or Agent of the Respondent: Ordered, that the said bond and the recognizance (whether entered into by the Appellants or by a substitute) be returned to the Parliament Office duly executed within one week from the date of the issue thereof to the Solicitor or Agent of the Appellant or Appellants. On default by the Appellant or Appellants in complying with the above conditions, the appeal to stand dismissed.

"Standing Order V.

"1. Ordered, that in English appeals the printed cases and the appendix thereto be lodged in the Parliament Office within six weeks from the date of the presentation of the appeal to the House; in Scotch and Irish appeals, within eight weeks; and the appeal set down for hearing on the first *sitting* day after the expiration of those respective periods (or as soon before, at the option of either party, as all the printed cases and the appendix shall have been lodged); on default by the Appellant the appeal to stand dismissed.

"2. Ordered, that in all Appeals from Scotland the Appellant alone, in his printed case or in the appendix thereto, shall lay before this House a printed copy of the record as authenticated by the Lord Ordinary; together with a supplement containing an account, without argument or statement of other facts, of the further steps which have been taken in the cause since the record was completed, and containing also copies of the interlocutors or parts of interlocutors complained of; and each party shall in their cases lay before the House a copy of the case presented by them respectively to the Court of Session, if any such case was presented there, with a short summary of any additional reasons upon which he means to insist; and if there shall have been no case presented to the Court of Session, then each party shall set forth in his case the reasons upon which he founds his argument, as shortly and succinctly as possible.

"3. Ordered, that all printed cases be signed by one or more counsel, who shall have attended as counsel in the court below, or shall purpose attending as counsel at the hearing in this House.

"Standing Order VI.

Ordered, that all cross appeals be presented to the House within the period allowed by Standing Order No. V. for lodging cases in the original appeal.

"Standing Order VII.

"Ordered, with regard to appeals in which the periods severally dating from the presentation of the appeal under Standing Orders Nos. III., IV., V., and VI. expire during the recess of the House, that such periods be extended to the third sitting day of the next ensuing meeting of the House.

"Standing Order VIII.

"Ordered, that where any party or parties to an appeal shall die pending the same, subsequently to the printed cases having been lodged, and the appeal shall be revived against his or her representative or representatives as the person or persons standing in the place of the person or persons so dying as aforesaid, a supplemental case shall be lodged by the party or parties so reviving the same respectively, stating the Order or Orders respectively made by the House in such case.

"The like rule shall be observed by the Appellant and Respondent respectively, where any person or persons, party or parties in the court below, have been omitted to be made a party or parties in the appeal before this House, and shall, by leave of the House, upon petition or otherwise, be added as a party or parties to the said Appeal after the printed cases in such appeal shall have been lodged.

"Standing Order IX.

"Ordered, that when any petition of appeal shall be presented to this House from any interlocutory judgment of either division of the Lords of Session in Scotland, the counsel who shall sign the said petition, or two of the counsel for the party or parties in the court below, shall sign a certificate or declaration, stating either that leave was given by that division of the Judges pronouncing such interlocutory judgment to the Appellant or Appellants to present such petition of appeal, or that there was a difference of opinion amongst the judges of the said division pronouncing such interlocutory judgment.

"Standing Order X.

"Ordered, that in all cases in which this House shall make any order for payment of costs by any party or parties in any cause without specifying the amount, the Clerk of the Parliaments or Clerk Assistant shall, upon the application of either party, appoint such person as he shall think fit to tax such costs, and the person so appointed may tax and ascertain the amount thereof, and shall report the same to the Clerk of the Parliaments or Clerk Assistant: And it is further Ordered, that the same fees shall be demanded from and paid by the party applying for such taxation for and in respect thereof as are now or shall be fixed by any resolution of this House concerning such fees; and the said person so appointed to tax such costs may, if he thinks fit, either add or deduct the whole or a part of such fees at the foot of his report: And the Clerk of the Parliaments or Clerk Assistant may give a certificate of such costs, expressing the amount so reported to him as aforesaid; and the amount in money certified by him in such certificate shall be the sum to be demanded and paid under or by virtue of such order as aforesaid for payment of costs."

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the said Standing Orders be entered on the Roll of Standing Orders of this House.

Ordered, That the said Orders be printed and published, to the end all persons concerned may the better take notice of the same.

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till
To-morrow, Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 14th August, 1876.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* Donegal, *v.* Thomas Conolly, esquire, deceased.
Third Reading — Crossed Cheques [267], and *passed.*
Withdrawn — Toll Bridges (River Thames) (*re-comm.*) * [219]; Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Boroughs) (*re-comm.*) * [294].

The House met at half after Two of the clock.

LABOURERS' DWELLINGS (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

MR. BUTT asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he will consider the advisability of advising the issue during the Recess of a Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of the dwellings of the labouring classes in Ireland?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, I believe that during the last few years labourers' dwellings in Ireland have been greatly and generally improved; but I fear it must still be admitted that their condition is not by any means what could be desired. I have already paid some attention to this subject, but I am bound to say that I much doubt whether I could recommend to the Government any proposals for legislation which would be likely to have any practical effect with regard to it—unless, perhaps, by some change in the sanitary laws which might make it more easy to deal with dwellings unfit for human habitation. I will consider this point in the Recess, as an opportunity for such action might be found in the Bill to consolidate the Public Health Acts which I hope to introduce again next Session; and I will readily, also, look into the suggestion on the subject which the hon. and learned Member has been good enough to make in his Question.

PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING.

QUESTION.

MR. WHALLEY asked, Whether the Government will take into consideration the present system of reporting, for the information of the public, the debates and proceedings in this House; and, what means may be adopted for providing full reports of the debates as well after midnight as before?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, there was some little inconvenience in saying that a subject would be taken into consideration—that seemed to imply that the Government thought that some plan might be adopted, and that they would consider how they best might mature such plan, and propose it to Parliament. Looking to the terms of the hon. Gentleman's Question, Her Majesty's Government were not prepared to make any promise of that kind, especially as it appeared that the Question had reference to some alteration, he supposed, of the present system of reporting, not for the advantage of the House in particular, but for the information of the public, which rather seemed to resolve itself into a question of supply and demand. However, the matter was one which did involve some considerations of importance, and, therefore, if the hon. Gentleman and the House would understand that in saying what he did he was not to be understood as saying more than he did; he would say that the matter was one about which the Government would think during the Recess.

Mr. WHALLEY thanked the right hon. Gentleman for his reply, and stated that he would call attention to the subject on the Motion for the Adjournment of the House.

HYDE PARK CORNER.—QUESTION.

Lord ERNEST BRUCE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the absence of the First Commissioner of Works, not yet a Member of the House, Whether, after the repeated offers for the last three years of the late Commissioner to carry out some plan to lessen the traffic, during the London season, at Hyde Park Corner for the benefit of the public, he has any objection to give an assurance that the whole subject will be taken into the serious consideration of Her Majesty's Government before the next Session of Parliament?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, there could be no doubt of the importance of the Question. It was one which involved a great deal of difficulty, but it clearly required consideration. He had already been in communication with the present First Commissioner of Works on the subject, and could assure the House it was one which would obtain immediate consideration.

PUBLIC HEALTH—SUPERVISION OF DAIRY FARMS.—QUESTION.

Mr. CHARLEY asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether it is his intention to take any steps to carry out the views expressed in the Report of Mr. Power, the Commissioner appointed by the Board to inquire into the origin of the Eagley Milk Epidemic, that—

> "The case points to the urgent necessity for regulation and adequate supervision over the sanitary circumstances of dairy farms."

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, no steps could be taken to carry out the views quoted by the hon. Member without fresh legislation, and when the Public Health Act was under consideration last year, he gave some attention to the subject, but was satisfied on inquiry that it was too difficult a matter to be properly attended to in that Act. It was one, however, of serious importance, and should have his attention during the Recess.

PHŒNIX PARK (DUBLIN)—WHITEFIELD LODGE.—QUESTION.

Mr. BUTT asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it has been brought under the notice of the Lords of the Treasury that an offer has been accepted for the letting of Whitefield Lodge, a portion of the Phœnix Park, for a period of seventy-five years; and, whether the Lords of the Treasury will interfere to prevent such alienation of the property of the Crown being completed until this House has an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the subject?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, the hon. and learned Gentleman was correct in saying that it was proposed to let Whitefield Lodge, a portion of the Phœnix Park, for a term of 75 years. Serious objections were, however, expressed as to letting public property for so long a period of time, and as he (Mr. Smith) to some extent concurred therein he had been in communication with his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland in regard to the inexpediency of alienating Crown property for that period.

THE DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1868—PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS.

QUESTION.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, with reference to "The Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act, 1868," For an explanation of the circumstances which led to the increase of the remuneration of petty sessions clerks out of the proceeds of the dog tax from £4,968 0*s.* 2*d.* in 1871 to £10,932 9*s.* 4*d.* in 1875; whether it is not a fact that in 1875 £13,700 of the proceeds of the tax went in expenses of administration (including salaries and remuneration) of the Act, leaving £18,300 for distribution in relief of borough or county rates; whether he will inquire into the possibility of reducing the expenses within narrower limits; and whether the registrar under the Act holds any other office of emolument under Government than the registrarship; and, if so, what the salary attached to such office amounts to?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, in 1872 very strong representations were made to the Government by nearly all the benches of magistrates throughout Ireland pointing out the inadequate salaries paid to clerks of petty sessions under the Act of 1858, and how impossible it was to secure the services of competent clerks for such salaries. The clerks of petty sessions are county officers appointed by the magistrates and doing county work. The counties do not contribute any portion of their salaries, and it was, under these circumstances, considered a fair and legitimate application of a portion of the money received for the registration of dogs (which is collected by the clerks, and imposes on them very heavy additional labour and expense) to apply it to the increase of their remuneration. The amounts given in the second part of the Question are correct; but they include, in addition to the remuneration given to clerks of petty sessions, the very considerable expenses necessarily incurred under Sections 11 and 15 of the Act. The expenses could not be reduced except by reducing the payments to the clerks, and I should be very sorry to make such a proposal. The registrar under the Dogs Regulation Act (1865) is by the Act made to be the registrar under the Petty Sessions Clerks Act (1858) and the Fines Act (1851), and a third of his salary is made chargeable on the moneys realized under the Dogs Act.

INSPECTORS OF FISHERIES (IRELAND) —BYE-LAWS.—QUESTION.

MR. BUTT (for Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If he can state the circumstances which led to the delay of the approval of the Irish Privy Council of the two bye-laws hereinafter mentioned, namely :—

1. Bye-law. Skibbereen District, River Ilen, made by the Inspectors and dated 28th February, 1874; approved by the Privy Council 27th November, 1875;
2. Bye-law. Waterford District, made by the Inspectors and dated 17th April, 1874; approved by the Privy Council 13th January, 1875?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, bye-laws made by the Irish Inspectors of Fisheries are not approved by the Privy Council without first obtaining the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown as to their legality, and until opportunities have been had for their consideration by a Committee of the Privy Council, which, of course, can only act upon a reference from the Privy Council. With regard to the particular cases named, I am informed that the River Ilen Bye-law, made by the Inspectors on the 28th of February, 1874, was not received in the Council Office until the 23rd of May, 1874, as the legal formalities as to posting of notices, &c., which the Inspectors have to go through, necessarily occupy considerable time. It was submitted to the Privy Council on the 30th of June, at their next meeting after its receipt. It was then referred to the Law Officers, and upon its return with their opinion was considered by the Committee at their next meeting on the 20th of October. The Committee reported in its favour, and it was approved by the Privy Council at their next meeting, on the 27th of November, 1874. With respect to the Waterford District Bye-laws, the dates are as follows:—Made by the Inspectors, April 17, 1874; lodged in Council Office, November 24; submitted to Privy Council, November 27; considered by Committee, December 23; approved by Privy Council, January 13, 1875. I am bound to say that in both these cases some of the intervals, particularly between the making of the bye-law and its lodgment in the Privy Council Office, appear longer than I should have supposed were necessary. I will make further inquiry into the matter, with a view of preventing unnecessary delay (if any has occurred) in the future.

H.M.S. "MONARCH" AND THE "RALEIGH."—QUESTION.

MR. POTTER asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he can state to the House any particulars respecting the reported collision between Her Majesty's Ships "Monarch" and "Raleigh" in the fleet now stationed at Besika Bay?

MR. A. EGERTON, in reply, said, that no official communication had been received at the Admiralty respecting this collision; but a private letter had been received which stated that during the cruise of the Mediterranean Fleet the steam steering-gear of the *Triumph* broke, and that the *Monarch*, in avoiding that ship, fouled the *Raleigh*, causing the loss of one boat and damage to the fore-yard of the vessel. The matter was being inquired into by the Commander-in-Chief on the Mediterranean Station.

TURKEY—THE LOANS OF 1854 AND 1855.—QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, What is the present position of negotiations in reference to the payment of interest on the Turkish Loan of 1855, and what the consequent position of the Loan of 1854?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he had nothing material to add to what he had already stated to the House, but he would briefly recapitulate his former statement. On the 1st August, when the dividends were due upon the Guaranteed Loan of 1855, the Government were informed by the Bank of England that no funds had been placed in their hands by the Turkish Government which were applicable to the loan upon which the dividend had then to be paid. The Treasury accordingly authorized the Bank to make an advance in order that there might be no delay in the payment of the coupons, and he communicated with the Foreign Office upon the subject. He stated to that office that it would be the duty of the British Government, in the event of no funds being provided by the Turkish Government, to make good out of the Exchequer the amount which had been so advanced by the Bank of England, and to call upon the Government of France to make good one moiety of the advance. Steps were about to be taken for that purpose, after granting a sufficient interval for the purpose of allowing the Porte to put the Bank in funds; but while those communications which were necessary were going on with the Porte and the French Government, a Question was put to him (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) in that House by the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Errington), and in consequence of that Question, on his (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) asking for information from the Bank on the subject, an intimation was received that there were in the Bank of England some £60,000 on account of the Tribute Loan of 1854, and also an amount of £116,000 on account of the Tribute Loan of 1871. Under these circumstances the Government were now taking advice, and were in communication with the French Government on the question as to whether they should make any advance from the Treasury to meet the money which had been so advanced by the Bank. That was the state of the facts, and to them he had nothing to add.

METROPOLIS—ARTIZANS DWELLINGS ACT—LANCASHIRE COURT, BOND STREET.—QUESTION.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he will ascertain from the Metropolitan Board of Works their reason for neglecting to survey Lancashire Court, Bond Street, which was declared by the Medical Officer of Health of St. George's Parish in February last to be unfit for human habitation; and, whether any steps will be taken under the Artizans Dwellings Act to deal with this case?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS (for Mr. SCLATER BOOTH), in reply, said he would communicate with the Metropolitan Board of Works on the subject. He might add that it was their intention to deal, he did not know whether with this particular case, but with a great many cases, under the Artizans' Dwellings Act in the course of the year.

POOR LAW (SCOTLAND).—QUESTION.

MR. HOPE JOHNSTONE asked the Lord Advocate, Whether it is the intention of the Government in the ensuing Session to re-introduce the provisions of the Poor Law (Scotland) Bill in regard to medical relief and the appointment and emoluments of medical officers?

THE LORD ADVOCATE, in reply, said it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to re-introduce the provisions of the Poor Law (Scotland) Bill as regarded the subject mentioned in the Question of the hon. Member.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS—FINANCE.—QUESTION.

MR. HAYTER asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will consider during the Recess the propriety of withdrawing the assent of the Treasury to the moneys, varying from one to two millions, of the Metropolitan Board of Works being kept at the London and Westminster Joint Stock Bank; and, whether he will consider the question of urging the Metropolitan Board of Works to place them in the Bank of England, having regard to the increase of the balance since the Treasury was asked to sanction the original deposit made under the 41st section of the 32 and 33 Vic., cap. 102?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he had looked into the Act to which the hon. Gentleman referred, and he did not think it was competent under the provisions of that Act for the Treasury to consider the propriety of withdrawing its assent to the moneys being deposited in the bank referred to. The question raised for the consideration of the Treasury under the Act was simply this—that the Metropolitan Board should pay the moneys they received under the Act to a bank to be approved of by the Lords of the Treasury. A formal application was made by the Board to the Treasury to sanction the employment of the London and Westminster Joint Stock Bank. That assent was given, and it seemed to him that the Treasury had now, under the statute, nothing more to do in the matter. It was, however, a question whether it was not desirable that the Treasury should be withdrawn by some alteration of the statute from any connection with any particular Bank, because it did not appear to him that it was altogether a convenient position that the Metropolitan Board should have the apparent sanction of the Treasury in such a matter.

H.M.S. "THUNDERER."—QUESTION.

MR. E. J. REED asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to a statement in "The Times" of that day, in which the Coroner who is conducting the inquiry into the "Thunderer" explosion is represented to have said that the assessor prevented him from proceeding to take evidence, and, whether it is true that an assessor has the power to overrule the Coroner in that repect and to cause the further adjournment of the inquest?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had seen the statement referred to, but had not had an opportunity of consulting his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General on the subject. He had no doubt himself, however, that the sole control of the inquiry was in the hands of the Coroner.

PUBLIC HEALTH — DRAINAGE AND WATER SUPPLY OF UPPINGHAM—RETURN OF THE SCHOOL.

QUESTION.

MR. WHITWELL asked the President of the Local Government Board, If he is aware whether the local authorities of Uppingham have taken steps to commence the drainage works sanctioned by the Local Government Board; whether they have deferred advertising for tenders for the work till the operations for the water supply of the town have been provided; whether the town is liable for the costs incurred by the local authority in opposing the Water Supply Bill; or by further procrastination; and, whether the return of the school to the town has been postponed thereby till next year; and what steps the Local Government Board has taken to enforce the completion of the sanitary measures at Uppingham urgently necessary for checking the continued loss of life and injury to the school by the dangerous state of the drains?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, that the postponement of the return of pupils to this school was not due exclusively to the non-completion of drainage works.

GREECE—THE "AGRIGENTI" AND THE "HYLTON CASTLE."—QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. T. E. SMITH,

MR. BOURKE said, that the Government were not as yet aware whether the accused would be tried for murder or manslaughter. Her Majesty's Government had already given instructions to our Minister at Athens not only to watch the case narrowly, but to take care that a proper means of defence should be given to the captain.

MERCANTILE MARINE—THE CASE OF HORATIO WALTERS.—QUESTION.

CAPTAIN PIM asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he will take into consideration the case of Horatio Walters, late master of the ship "Emily Augusta," of Liverpool, now undergoing a sentence of penal servitude for fifteen years. He was found guilty of manslaughter in November, 1874, several of the crew having died on the passage from his alleged cruelty, although the real cause of death was never proved, and the men were known to have been shipped in a badly diseased state. Horatio Walters brought the "Emily Augusta" from Akyab to England with the greatest difficulty, after a stormy voyage of nearly six months. The crew, thirty-three in number, were all Lascars and blacks, the mates, one a German, the other a naturalized American; the only Englishman, besides Horatio Walters, being quite a lad. It was necessary to maintain a severe discipline under such very adverse circumstances, or the ship would have been lost more than once; and, if satisfied of these facts, will the right honourable Gentleman take the case of the unfortunate man into consideration, and if convinced that justice has been fully vindicated by the penal servitude already endured by Horatio Walters, recommend him for a pardon?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that hitherto no official representations had been made to the Home Office on the subject, but that inquiries would be made.

CROSSED CHEQUES BILL. [*Lords.*]

[BILL 267.] (*Mr. Attorney General.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

MR. J. G. HUBBARD said: Sir, the object of this Bill is to protect the community against the dangers affecting crossed cheques, arising from dishonesty in thieves and carelessness in bankers; and it has been introduced in response to the dissatisfaction occasioned by the decision in the case of "Smith *v.* the Union Bank of London." In that case a cheque of £21 9*s.* was drawn by Mills and Co. upon the Union Bank of London, payable to Smith or his order. Smith received the cheque, endorsed it, and crossed it "London and County Bank." The cheque was stolen by a thief, whose transferee paid it into the London and Westminster Bank to his own credit. The London and Westminster Bank improperly presented the cheque, and the Union Bank improperly paid it, and returned it to Mills, to whose debit it was placed. Mills, possessing a genuine acquittance from Smith, is satisfied; but Smith, not having received the amount, claims it from the Union Bank, who paid it wrongfully. The Court of Common Pleas negatived Smith's claim, and that decision was upon appeal confirmed by the Supreme Court upon these grounds:—1st, that the negotiability of the cheque was not restrained by the crossing; 2ndly, that the customer of the London and Westminster Bank was the lawful owner of the cheque; 3rdly, that Smith had no property in the cheque; and, 4thly, that Mills and Co., as drawers, were alone qualified to bring an action upon it. To amend the law as thus expounded, the Bill before the House was introduced; its earlier clauses define the terms used, and in the 7th clause it recites the law as already expressed in the Statute Book; but it adds, in the 10th clause, the needful enforcement of the law in the following terms:—

> "Any banker paying a cheque crossed generally otherwise than to a banker, or a cheque crossed specially otherwise than to the banker, to whom the same shall be crossed, or his agent for collection, being a banker, shall be liable to the true owner of the cheque for any loss he may sustain, owing to the cheque having been so paid."

Up to that point I think the Bill is perfectly clear and satisfactory, and at that point I should have been satisfied to stop. I had introduced a Bill at the commencement of the Session to provide that bankers should not with impunity neglect the instructions upon a cheque; but I withdrew my own Bill in consequence of a measure having been introduced in the House of Lords which had the advantage of summing up the whole law into one statute, and of making a clear exposition as to what was hereafter to be a guide to commercial men and bankers. The author of the Bill in the House of Lords did not think it sufficient to leave the declaration of the law in that particular shape. It appears to have been thought necessary to define who was the "true owner" of a cheque; and that attempt no doubt may have been rendered necessary by the circumstance that in the judgment delivered in the case of "Smith *v.* the Union Bank," the Court declared that Smith, the plaintiff, could not maintain an action for the cheque stolen from him, and it had recognized in the person who received it from the thief the "true and lawful owner." Therefore, if that view were accepted, it would become necessary to define the "true owner" referred to in the 10th clause. I should have thought that the true owner would have been admitted to be the person from whom the cheque was stolen; but the decision in the case of "Smith *v.* the Union Bank," seems to have been based upon the one assumption, that, however clear the instructions given to the banker by the crossing, "they could not restrain the negotiability of the cheque," a phrase which recognized the title of the actual possessor, and I anxiously call the attention of the House to the grounds on which the negotiability of cheques is assumed, because—if, as I think it can be shown—there is no antecedent necessity for ascribing the especial negotiability to crossed cheques, then the difficulty felt by the Court in the case to which I have referred, need not have existed, and the true ownership in the cheque might easily have been settled. The cases cited in the Court of Appeal, as establishing the negotiability of crossed cheques were "Bellamy *v.* Majoribanks," "Carlyon *v.* Ireland," and "Simmonds *v.* Taylor." I have referred to the Law Reports, and I find that the case of "Bellamy *v.* Majoribanks" was tried as far back as 1852; its purport was to recover from Coutts & Co. the value of a crossed cheque paid over the counter, and in the judgment it was laid down by Baron Parke—

> "That the crossing of a cheque payable to bearer with the name of a banker does not restrain the negotiability of the cheque to that banker."

In the case of "Carlyon *v.* Ireland," tried in January, 1856, the Judges in the Queen's Bench agreed "that a cheque payable to 'bearer' was negotiable, and that the crossing left it negotiable." But in 1856 the statute 19 & 20 *Vict.* c. 25, was passed for the purpose of correcting the effect of those particular decisions, and it enacted—

> "That a cheque which was crossed either '& Co.' or with the name of a particular bank should only be paid to or through some banker."

Subsequently to the passing of that Act in May, 1857, the case of "Simmonds *v.* Taylor" was brought before the Exchequer Courts, and in that case it was declared that—"a crossed cheque presented with the crossing obliterated might be justifiably paid to a stranger." The judgment was unimpeachable as to the point of law which it decided, but the language of the judgment went far beyond the particular necessity of the case, and the learned Judge (Baron Bramwell) enunciated a *dictum* of a most important character. He stated on that occasion—"The negotiability of the cheque is not and never was affected by crossing;" and he added—"It is impossible to make the crossing a part of the instrument and yet preserve its negotiability." Baron Bramwell could not reconcile the negotiability of a cheque with the operative power of the crossing, but what was the action taken by the mercantile community after that ruling had been laid down? The *obiter dictum* of Baron Bramwell led to the immediate introduction of a Bill into this House—a Bill that was passed into law in the same year, 1858. This Act, 20 & 21 *Vict.* c. 79, was perfectly clear and most stringent in its terms with regard to the efficacy of crossing. The Act declared—

> "That the crossing should be deemed a material part of the cheque, and that no banker should pay a cheque crossed '& Co.' except to a banker; or should pay a cheque crossed to a particular banker except to that banker."

As between the assumed negotiability of a crossed cheque and the efficacy of the crossing, the commercial community decided in favour of the efficacy of the crossing. One might have thought that the fact of two separate Acts having been passed in order to negative the particular attribute of negotiability judicially assigned to crossed cheques would have been sufficient; but the judgment in the case of "Smith *v.* The Union Bank of London" has exhibited the strength and tenacity of the force of legal traditions, and has shown that lawyers have attached an almost superstitious veneration to what they call the "negotiability of cheques." And upon what authority is this quality of negotiability in crossed cheques affirmed in the judgment delivered by Baron Bramwell in "Smith *v.* The Union Bank of London?" The cases "Bellamy *v.* Majoribanks," "Carlyon *v.* Ireland," and "Simmonds *v.* Taylor," are cited as "clearly showing that, whatever may have been the effect of a crossing, the negotiability of the cheque was not thereby restrained"—that is to say, the decisions delivered in 1852 and in 1856, and corrected by legislation in 1856 and 1858, and a *dictum* enunciated in 1858, and specifically corrected by legislation in the same year, are cited in 1876 in support of a theory which has been repudiated by the mercantile community, and again and again discountenanced by statute law. And what is the force and meaning of the term? When cheques are called "negotiable," we must remember that the word is one of very doubtful import as applied to such documents. There are cheques, there are bank notes, and there are bills of exchange, and they have all been called "negotiable," but they are severally documents of entirely different characters. A bank note is as paper money a part of the circulating medium, of which the title passes with possession from hand to hand, a bill of exchange may with perfect accuracy be described as a "negotiable" document, for its transfer is matter of bargain, in which interest of money and period of maturity are elements in the negotiation; but a cheque stands between the two. It does not, like a bank note, circulate from hand to hand upon its intrinsic security, nor is it like a bill of exchange, negotiable at a discount—it is a document which only passes at its value from the drawer to the payee, the transfer of its amount being its sole purpose. That being the case, it is gravely inaccurate to say that a cheque ought of course to be negotiable like a bill of exchange, or to circulate like a bank note, when in its nature and its office it is essentially different from both the one and the other. The judgment in "Smith *v.* the Union Bank of London" concludes with the remark that—

> "If the statute had meant to prevent any person from becoming lawful holder of a crossed cheque, unless he derived title through lawful holders—this ought to have been expressed;"

and a learned writer (B), in a letter to *The Economist* of 1st January last, suggested these words—

> "Any person taking a cheque crossed with a banker's name or & Co. in transverse lines, shall have no better title to it than the person of whom he took it had."

Assuming the necessity for some definition of the "true owner," this clause seems well fitted for its purpose, and it appeared in the Lord Chancellor's Bill, but with the substitution of the words "crossed specially" for the word "crossed." The word "specially" struck out when the clause first came under the consideration of the Committee, was re-inserted when the Bill came again unexpectedly under revision in a thin House. Not one crossed cheque out of 100 is crossed "specially." The cheques used in payment of the dividends of the public funds, of the dividends of railway companies and others, are cheques payable to "order" and crossed "& Co."—it cannot be otherwise. The Bank of England and the various public companies know the names of their payees, but they do not the bankers of those payees—many of whom indeed have no banker—but the system pursued has been found convenient, and has been thought to be secure. The insecurity disclosed by the judgment in Smith's case, it has been professedly the object of the present Bill to remove; but by the insertion of the word "specially" in the 12th clause the great mass of crossed cheques are deprived even of the protection which earlier statutes were supposed to give them, for in accordance with the legal axiom "*expressio unius est exclusio alterius*" the thief barred from a title through possession of a cheque crossed specially, is recognized as acquiring a title through possession of a cheque crossed generally. This result seems a remarkable and highly unsatisfactory achievement of a Bill introduced for the purpose of protecting crossed cheques from loss arising in the carelessness of bankers and the dishonesty of thieves. Apprehensions have been expressed that the business effected through the medium of crossed cheques, passing from hand to hand, against which, when once paid, value is freely given without the fear of ulterior risk, would be materially obstructed if invalidity of title to a cheque, or, in other words, the discovery that it had been stolen, were to be the occasion of a call for restitution from the receiver of the amount. That transactions adjusted through such a medium take place, may be admitted, but I contend that it is neither necessary, expedient, nor just, that a circulating medium of crossed cheques should be substituted for the legal currency of coin or bank notes in small transactions or for the use of cheques drawn for the occasion in larger ones. A qualified purchaser can have no difficulty in providing a legitimate means of payment. No public advantage is attained by prolonging the circulation of a cheque, while every days' delay in its presentation is injurious to the drawer, since the failure of the banker on whom he draws would leave the intended payment unaccomplished. The payee whose definitive acquisition of its amount is thus postponed is also injuriously affected by the deferred satisfaction of a cheque, and no one, in truth, benefits by its circulation except the banker, who retains its amount for his own benefit. contrary to the interest and intention of his depositor. This benefit is no legitimate banking profit. In "another place" an eminent lawyer expounding the Lord Chancellor's Bill, remarked—

> "That the object of the Cheque Bank was, that its cheques crossed generally should pass over the counter and from hand to hand like money,"

and he deprecated any interference with that practice; but, Sir, I venture to assert that this practice is a distinct evasion of the Currency Laws, which prohibit the creation of a spurious paper currency for private advantage, and claim the right of issuing credit notes for the Crown alone in the interest of the community. I commend the doctrine of the Lord Chancellor on this subject to the serious consideration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There may, I will admit, be inconvenience in a sudden change of system, even though it be a manifest improvement, and I have already intimated that I should be satisfied if the 12th clause commenced thus—"A person taking a crossed cheque 'payable to order' shall not have," &c.—the effect of this discrimination would be to leave cheques payable to "bearer" subject to the free handling and consequent risks which now affect them, but it would secure to the drawer of the cheque to "order" the power of effectually indicating that the order for the transfer of a given sum from himself to the payee should be consummated at the earliest moment. This, surely, is no unreasonable demand. A crossed cheque to "order" need not be stamped with the words "not negotiable," its construction ought to suffice to indicate its proper treatment. It may, and must in some cases, as heretofore, find persons ready to assist the payee, and become the medium through whom it would be realized, but it would be taken by each intermediary, including the receiving banker in dependence upon the giver, whose indorsement should furnish a ready resort for redress in case of theft if such occurred, but thefts which could not be utilized would quickly cease. My proposal has not, however, been accepted by the Government, and therefore to return to this Bill, I have to say that Clause 12 is at variance with the earlier part of the Bill and with itself. The 7th and 10th clauses protect all crossed cheques; the 12th clause limits its protection to cheques crossed specially. The same individual who, as the "person" taking from the thief the stolen cheque, is in the first paragraph of the 12th clause declared to have no title to the cheque, is in the second paragraph, as a "banker," absolved from all liability to the true owner of the cheque, of which he (the banker) has received the amount. I think, therefore, that the proper course would be this —either to let the whole Bill stand over (as the matter is one of great moment), or to let the first 11 clauses, which are perfectly unimpeachable, stand by themselves and become law; and in another year, if it be necessary, the measure that is now passed could be supplemented. On these grounds I have to move that this Bill be re-committed, and if is re-committed, I shall move the exclusion of the 12th clause. I will only add one word in conclusion. I hope I shall not be supposed to be arguing this question with a feeling adverse to the bankers. It would be absurd for me to do that. I have for many years myself been connected with a banking institution quite as important as any represented in this House, I mean the Bank of England, of which I was Governor in 1854, when the Bill passed which originated the use of "cheques to order," and it was upon my suggestion that the 19th section was inserted, giving a protection to bankers, without which they could not have accepted the working of such cheques at all. But deeply as I am interested in the Bank of England, I do not hesitate to say that even if it incurred any risk through the provisions which I advocate, such a consideration would never induce me to take a course which I did not think would be for the advantage of the whole community. I have, Sir, only now to move that the Bill be re-committed.

Mr. E. HUBBARD seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now read the third time," in order to insert the word "re-committed."—(*Mr. J. G. Hubbard.*)

The ATTORNEY GENERAL, in opposing the Amendment, said, he had a compromise to propose which he hoped would meet with general acceptance. The necessity for that Bill, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. J. G. Hubbard) stated, had been occasioned by reason of the decision in Smith against the Union Bank of London. A cheque in that case was given by Mill to Smith, or rather was made payable to the order of Smith, and was crossed to a particular banker. It was drawn upon the Union Bank of London. When it got into the hands of Smith, the payee, he endorsed it, and it became payable to bearer and a negotiable instrument. It was then stolen and passed through various hands until it came into the hands of a person who gave value for it and took it without notice, and who was, therefore, entitled to it. It was presented, not to the Bank to which it was crossed, but to the London and Westminster Bank, and by an error on the part of the Union Bank of London, it was paid to the London and Westminster Bank. Smith then brought his action against the Union Bank of London because it had disobeyed the injunction of the Act of Parliament by paying the cheque to the London and Westminster Bank instead of to the Bank to which it was crossed. The Court of Queen's Bench, and afterwards the Court of Appeal, decided that Smith, who had lost his cheque, could not recover against the Union Bank of London, because if that Bank had not paid the cheque to the London and Westminster Bank the cheque would have been in the hands of a person who had a title to it; that Smith, therefore, could not have got it; and that thus, though the provisions of the Act had been disobeyed, Smith had not been damnified. That decision, which seemed to him in strict accordance with law, gave rise to much alarm among the commercial community, which desired that some mode should be invented by which a cheque should be made safe, and a remedy given to the person from whom it had been stolen if the paying bank chose to disregard the provisions of the statute. To accomplish that object this Bill had been introduced. But it was also desirable, as far as possible, to avoid interfering with the negotiability of cheques. It would be most disastrous to trade if within six years somebody could come down on a firm which had received a cheque as so much money, and had applied it to the benefit of a customer, and require them to refund. What they wanted was a means by which a cheque should be secure from the depredation of thieves and from the carelessness of bankers. He therefore proposed to re-commit the Bill, in order so to frame the 12th clause as that the person taking a cheque should not have a better title in it, or be capable of giving to another person a better title to it than the man from whom he took it, and to make that provision applicable to a cheque crossed generally or specially, and bearing in either case as part of the crossing the words "not negotiable." He would in such cases exempt them from liability, unless they should be proved to have acted with negligence. He thought that what he proposed would meet the views of his right hon. Friend and of those who desired that the provisions of the Bill should not unnecessarily restrain the negotiability of a cheque. Cheques crossed generally or specially he would leave as they were now. If that proposal would meet the views of the right hon. Gentleman, the re-committal of the Bill would be assented to.

Question, "That the words 'now read the third time,' stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Question proposed, "That the word 're-committed' be there inserted."

Sir SYDNEY WATERLOW said, he was opposed to undue restrictions on cheques generally crossed, which constituted the large bulk of cheques. He therefore thought that Clause 12 should be restored to its original form by leaving out the words "specially crossed." It would be an injury to the public to prevent the circulation of such cheques and to compel them to resort to bank-notes and gold in lieu of them. He believed the words suggested would remove all difficulty, and he therefore trusted they would be accepted, and the omission of the 12th clause resisted. It gave what we did not now possess—a form of cheque which was absolutely protected; for at present a cheque specially crossed was not so protected. We should then have four kinds of cheques—open, payable to bearer; open, payable to order, which could not be cashed by the wrong person without his committing forgery; generally crossed, payable to order, which must be paid by banker to banker; and crossed specially, in which the holders would have no more right than the persons from whom they received them, and which would facilitate the payment of large sums direct to the bankers of the persons entitled to the money.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY thought that they were under very great obligation to his right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. J. G. Hubbard) for bringing the subject forward, and he trusted his right hon. Friend would accept the Amendment suggested by the hon. and learned Attorney General, for it would, at all events, meet the greater part, if not all, of his objection.

THE LORD MAYOR (Mr. Alderman COTTON) said, the Bill ought to be more truthfully described as a Bankers' Bill, its main object being their protection; indeed, Clause 12 was the only clause which could be said to protect the public. The argument had been that unless the word "specially" were in Clause 12 it would prevent the due circulation of cheques crossed "and Co.," but that would not be so, because there was the facility of crossing cheques paying to bearer. Cheques crossed "and Co" ought not to be taken over the counter except from a person who was well known. He did not exactly know what was meant by the words "not negotiable," for crossed cheques ought to be negotiable. They ought to be content to have the word "specially" taken out of the clause, and if the hon. and learned Attorney General consented to the omission of that word he, and those who concurred with his right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London, would be perfectly content with the Bill. If not, however, they would prefer that the Bill should stand over until next Session.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA thought the hon. and learned Attorney General's words were rather too restrictive, and suggested the words, "not otherwise negotiable." He entirely agreed in the opinions expressed by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. J. G. Hubbard).

MR. MARTEN thought the proposed Amendment of the hon. and learned Attorney General would meet the object in view, which was to protect cheques against thieves. As to the general question of negotiability of cheques, he had communicated with several persons of experience in the country, and they agreed in thinking that as to many parts of the country it would be most unadvisable that the negotiability of cheques should be interfered with, except by some such process as that proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he was willing to agree that the Bill should be re-committed for the purpose of making alterations in Clauses 4, 5, and 12, and would move accordingly.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment to add, at the end, the words "in respect of Clauses 4, 5, and 12."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

MR. J. G. HUBBARD said, he should have preferred the re-commitment of the Bill generally.

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *re-committed* in respect of Clauses 4, 5, and 12.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 4 (General and special crossings).

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved, as an Amendment, in page 1, line 24, to insert after the word "banker" the words "and either with or without the words 'not negotiable.'"

The LORD MAYOR (Mr. Alderman Cotton) wished to know how the Amendment would affect Clause 12?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that he wanted Clause 12 to apply only to cheques crossed specially or generally, but bearing the words "not negotiable."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Crossing after issue).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved, as an Amendment, in page 2, after "collection," to insert as a separate paragraph, "where a cheque is crossed generally or specially the lawful owner may add the words 'not negotiable.'"

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Title of holder of cheque crossed specially).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved, as an Amendment, in page 3, line 10, after the word "cheque," to insert the words "crossed generally or specially, and bearing in either case the words 'not negotiable,'" in lieu of the words "crossed generally or specially to himself."

Mr. BUTT observed, that the effect of the Amendment would be to exempt from liability a careless banker, who, receiving a cheque from a person who had stolen it, collected the amount and handed it over to the thief.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that the banker would rely upon the respectability of his customer. He would only collect a cheque for a person whom he knew, and that person would be liable, as he ought to be, in the case suggested by his hon. and learned Friend.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, that if the banker accounted to the wrong person he ought to be held responsible.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that if he had two cheques, one not crossed and the other crossed in the manner contemplated by the Amendment, and that he brought them as he would do to his bankers, they would in due course collect the amounts and hand them over or place them to his credit, and, having done all that they could be reasonably called upon to do, they ought not to be held responsible.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD observed, that if one of the two cheques had been stolen and came into the hands of the hon. and learned Gentleman, and through him to his banker, such banker ought to be primarily liable to be the true owner for the amount of the stolen cheque.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, in the case suggested, the true owner would have his remedy as against him (the Attorney General), and if he had received the stolen cheque from his right hon. Friend, then the remedy would lie against both of them, even if he had received the cheque *bonâ fide* from his right hon. Friend.

Sir SYDNEY WATERLOW said, that the banker would know his customer, and they could not suppose he would not give up the name.

The LORD MAYOR (Mr. Alderman Cotton) said, the banker would have no right to present a cheque from a disreputable person, and if the cheque were stolen the owner could fall back upon the customer from whom the banker had collected the amount.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Question, "That the clause, as amended, be *agreed to?*"

Mr. BUTT suggested the propriety of omitting the last five lines of the clause. He said that the clause provided that a person who took a cheque marked "not negotiable," should not have or be capable of giving a better title than that which the person from whom he took it had; but there was a further provision, which he thought it would be desirable to omit. It was to this effect—that a banker who had in good faith and without negligence received payment for a customer of such a cheque should not, in case the title to the cheque should prove defective, incur any liability to the true owner of the cheque by reason only of having received such payment.

Mr. WHITWELL advised that legislation on the subject should be suspended until next Session, and moved to report Progress.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that the House was quite competent to deal with the matter at once.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. W. H. SMITH) said, he must remind the Committee that there was no Amendment before them.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill reported.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Bill, as amended, be considered," —(*Mr. Attorney General,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

MR. BUTT said, that he did not see why, if they made every other person who took a cheque marked "not negotiable" answer for the channel from which it had come, they should stop at the banker, and place him in a position of non-responsibility in negotiating cheques which had been crossed. He would therefore move that the last paragraph of the clause be omitted.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 8, to leave out from the word "had" to the word "payment," in line 13, inclusive.—(*Mr. Butt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, the banker received the money on a cheque for a customer, and therefore the customer ought to be held liable.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the matter had been argued at considerable length, and was ripe for decision. The point was that the banker stood in a different position from the customers inasmuch as he merely received the money for his customer, who certainly ought to bear the responsibility in the event of the cheque having been improperly obtained.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 61; Noes 16: Majority 45.

Bill read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL.

LORDS' CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENT.

MR. SPEAKER said, that the Lords had agreed to the Amendments in this Bill which this House had made in their Amendments, and did not insist on those to which this House had disagreed, but had made a consequential Amendment to which they desired the concurrence of this House.

Said consequential Amendment read by the Clerk at the Table.

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY moved that the House agree with the Lords in the said Amendment. The new clause ran in the same form as the clause relating to foreign-going vessels, its terms being only adapted to coasters.

MR. T. E. SMITH said, the clause appeared to him to be suited to attain the object in view.

MR. PLIMSOLL expressed his satisfaction that the penalty attached to submerging a vessel below the load-line would be applicable to coasters as well as to foreign-going ships.

Motion *agreed to.*

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

CONSIDERATION OF LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

VISCOUNT SANDON, in moving that the Lords' Amendments be agreed to, explained that they were all of a simply formal and verbal character, and did not involve any question of principle.

MR. WHALLEY took occasion to offer his humble protest against the whole Bill, from the Preamble to the Schedules. It was not an Education Bill, and it was in no sense elementary.

MR. SPEAKER called the hon. Member to Order, observing that his observations were not relevant to the specific Amendments under consideration.

Motion *agreed to.*

PHŒNIX PARK (DUBLIN) — WHITEFIELD LODGE.—MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. BUTT moved for Copies of any Correspondence between the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of

Public Works in Ireland on the subject of letting Whitefield Lodge, Phœnix Park.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present—

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he had not been aware that it had been decided to let Whitefield Lodge for so long a term as 75 years, and saw no objection to the production of the Correspondence.

Motion *agreed to.*

Copies *ordered,* "of any Correspondence between the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland on the subject of letting Whitefield Lodge in the Phœnix Park:"

"Of any Minutes of the Commissioners of Public Works relating thereto:"

"Of the advertisement offering the lands for letting:"

"And, of any proposals made for the taking of the house and lands."

LAND TENURE (IRELAND).

ADDRESS FOR A ROYAL COMMISSION.

The O'DONOGHUE rose to call attention to the state of Land Tenure in Ireland, and to move—

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She may be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the state of Land Tenure in Ireland and the condition of the occupiers of land."

The question was a most important one to the occupiers of land in Ireland, who numbered 650,000, and amongst whom there was but one opinion, and that was that the present state of the question could not be endured by them. On the other hand, it was said by the landlords that the condition of the occupiers of land under them in Ireland was one that they ought to be satisfied with, and such as any man of industry might reasonably be satisfied with. The occupiers of land, on their part, stated that they had no security of tenure but what the landowners choose to give them. The farmers complained of their uncertainty of tenure, and that while they occupied their land at a fair rent, they were yet in a state requiring security for their holdings, and they were therefore desirous that a Royal Commission should issue to inquire into the Land Tenure question in Ireland.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at ten minutes after Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 15*th August,* 1876.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Royal Assent*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 60]; Exhausted Parish Lands [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 62]; Poor Law Amendment [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 61]; Agricultural Holdings (England) Act (1875) Amendment [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 74]; Police (Expenses) Act Continuance [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 64]; Legal Practitioners [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 66]; Suez Canal (Shares) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 67]; War Department and Post Office (Remuneration, &c.) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 68]; Crossed Cheques [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 81]; Juries Procedure (Ireland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 78]; Notices to Quit (Ireland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 63]; Merchant Shipping [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 80]; Elementary Education [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 79]; Pollution of Rivers [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 75]; Municipal Privileges (Ireland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 76]; Sheriff Courts (Scotland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 70]; Expiring Laws Continuance [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 69]; Cruelty to Animals [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 77]; Pensions Commutation Act Amendment [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 73]; Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 71]; Norwich and Boston Corrupt Voters [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 72]; Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment (Dublin) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 65]; Erne Lough and River [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxxvii]; Ardglass Harbour [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxxvi]; Bow Street Police Court (Site) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxxviii]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artizans and Labourers Dwellings) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxxv]; Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxxix].

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—HER MAJESTY'S SPEECH.

The PARLIAMENT was this day prorogued by Commission.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that Her Majesty had been pleased to grant two several ommissions, one for declaring Her oyal Assent to several Acts agreed pon by both Houses of Parliament, nd the other for proroguing the Parliaent:—And the Lords Commissioners -namely, The Lord Chancellor; The ord President of the Council (The uke of Richmond and Gordon); The ord Chamberlain (The Marquess of ertford); The Earl of Hardwicke; nd the Earl of Bradford—being in eir Robes, and seated on a Form etween the Throne and the Woolsack; nd the Commons being come, with their peaker, and the Commission to that urpose being read, the Royal Assent as given to several Bills.

Then The LORD CHANCELLOR *elivered* Her Majesty's Speech, as llows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"I am happy to be able to release ou from your attendance in Parliaent.

"My relations with all Foreign owers are of a friendly character, nd I look forward confidently to the aintenance of the good understanding hich now prevails.

"The efforts which, in common with ther Powers, I have made to bring bout a settlement of the differences nfortunately existing between the orte and its Christian subjects in osnia and Herzegovina have hitherto een unsuccessful, and the conflict egun in those Provinces has been exended to Servia and Montenegro. hould a favourable opportunity preent itself, I shall be ready, in concert ith My Allies, to offer My good ffices for the purpose of mediation beween the contending parties; bearing n mind alike the duties imposed upon Me by Treaty obligations and those which arise from considerations of umanity and policy.

"A difference has arisen between My Government and that of the United States, as to the proper construction of that Article of the Treaty of 9th August 1842, which relates to the mutual surrender of persons accused of certain offences. The inconveniences to both countries which would follow on a cessation of the practice of extradition are great and obvious, and I entertain the hope that a new arrangement may soon be arrived at, by which this matter may be placed on a satisfactory footing.

"I am deeply thankful that My dear Son, the Prince of Wales, has returned in good health from his lengthened journey through India. His presence in that part of My dominions has given occasion for the expression of feelings of loyalty and devotion to My Throne which I highly value.

"In pursuance of the power conferred upon Me, I have, by Proclamation, assumed the title of Empress of India. In making, as regards India, this addition to the ancient style of My Crown, I have desired to record, on an occasion of peculiar interest to Me, the earnest solicitude which I feel for the happiness of My Indian people.

"I trust that peace and order are re-established in the Malay Peninsula, and that the Rulers of the Native States will cheerfully accept the recommendations and assistance of My officers for the better government of their territories.

"The visit to this country of the President of the Orange Free State has resulted in a satisfactory settlement of the long controversy which has existed with reference to the Province of Griqua-Land, and an important advance has thus been made towards that friendly and cordial co-operation of neighbouring States which is essential to the interests of South Africa.

"The Conference on South African affairs, with regard to which Papers have already been laid before you, is now sitting in London, and cannot fail to contribute largely to the settlement of various important questions.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons*,

"I thank you for the liberal supplies which you have voted for the public service.

"The additional outlay required to place My army and navy upon a proper footing of efficiency, and the check which has been given to the advance of the revenue by the comparative stagnation of trade, have compelled me to propose to you an increase of taxation. I desire to acknowledge the readiness with which you have responded to that appeal, and at the same time to assure you that no effort shall be wanting to keep the expenditure of the country within the bounds of moderation.

"I notice with satisfaction the increasing attention paid by you to the question of Local Finance, and your greater watchfulness over the cost of services which are every year becoming more important, and the consideration of which ought not to be dissevered from that of Imperial expenditure.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen*,

"The Act which you have passed for the amendment of the Laws relating to Merchant Shipping will, I trust, promote the safety of our ships and seamen, without imposing unnecessary restrictions upon the conduct of a service in the prosperity of which our national interests are in so many ways involved.

"The measure for making further provision respecting the Elementary Education of the country is one of great importance, and will complete the work on which successive Parliaments have for many years been engaged, by securing a due attendance at school of the children for whose benefit the means and the machinery of Education have been so largely supplied.

"I have readily given My assent to a Bill for facilitating the Regulation and Improvement of Commons, and for making such amendments in the Inclosure Acts as will, I hope, tend to the preservation of open spaces in the neighbourhood of large towns, and to the increase of the health and comfort of My people.

"The serious evils arising from the Pollution of Rivers have long been the subject of public complaint, and I rejoice that you have passed a measure which, by checking those evils, will improve the sanitary condition of the country.

"I have observed with much satisfaction the arrangements which you have made for maintaining and increasing the efficiency of the Tribunal of Ultimate Appeal for the United Kingdom, by which, at the same time, the Judicial Committee of My Privy Council and My Intermediate Court of Appeal will be improved and strengthened.

"I anticipate the best results from the Act which you have passed providing safeguards against painful experiments upon Living Animals.

"I regret that pressure of other business has prevented the completion of your labours upon several measures of much importance. Among these I specially notice the Bills relating to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, to the Administration of Prisons, and to the Law affecting Maritime Contracts. I trust, however, that the attention which you have given to these questions in the past Session may facilitate their settlement in the next.

"In bidding you farewell, I pray that the blessing of Providence may rest on your recent labours, and accompany you in the discharge of all your duties."

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Tuesday the thirty-first day of October next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Tuesday the thirty-first day of October next.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 15th August, 1876.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—Emile Algernon Arthur Keppell Cowell Stepney, esquire, *for* Carmarthen Borough.

The House met at half after One of the clock.

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUEM—GRATUITIES TO THE POLICE.

QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the gratuities to the Police doing duty at the South Kensington Museum are less than those received by the constables at the National Gallery, British Museum, and India Museum; and, whether a suggestion to equalize them has been made by the Education Department to the Treasury?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that it was true that the gratuities to the police on duty at South Kensington Museum were less than those which were received at some other public institutions. A suggestion on the subject had been made by the Education Department to the Treasury to have those gratuities equalized; but it had been pointed out that the matter ought to be dealt with by the Commissioners of Police.

IRELAND—THE CORPORATION OF DUBLIN.—QUESTION.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the Local Government Board for Ireland have taken any steps to compel the Public Health Committee of the Corporation of Dublin to co-operate with the Sanitary Board of the North Dublin Union for the purpose of carrying out the much-needed sewerage of Drumandra, already strongly recommended by the Local Government Board to the Sanitary Committee of the North Dublin Union?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I was not aware that this Question would be asked until I saw it on the Notice Paper this morning, and consequently I am not in a position to give that definite information in reply to it without which any answer might be only misleading. But I should hope that the sanitary authority of the City of Dublin would be disposed without compulsion on the part of the Local Government Board to afford to their neighbours any aid in such a matter as this which the law may require, so far as it is possible for them to do so.

COMMON PLEAS (IRELAND)— RESIGNATION OF CHIEF JUSTICE.

MOTION FOR A PAPER.

Mr. BUTT, in moving for a Copy of the Letter of Resignation of the late Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Ireland, said, his intention in making that Motion was to call the attention of the Chief Secretary for Ireland to the fact that a vacancy had been created in the Court by the elevation of Chief Justice Morris to the Chief Justiceship, and that that vacancy had not been filled up. It was not his intention to go into the general question of the reduction of the number of Judges in Ireland, which, he believed, was contemplated by the Judicature Bill, and was urged by certain parties. He would only say he was himself opposed to that; but if it was to take place, he certainly considered that it was not in the Court of Common Pleas that this reduction should be made. He thought so because it was that Court that had the trial of Election Petitions, and that for that reason it should have its full complement of Judges. This was not a matter of mere speculation. Immediately after the last Election a Petition was lodged against the return of his hon. Friend (Dr. O'Leary) for the borough of Drogheda. The Judge who tried the Petition thought the case so important that he reserved it for the Court of Common Pleas to determine how far the irregularities alleged to have taken place in the mode of conducting the Ballot vitiated the return. The Court of Common Pleas was divided on the question. Chief Justice Monahan and Mr. Justice Morris were of opinion that they did not vitiate the election, and Mr. Justice Lawson and Mr. Justice Keogh thought they did. The Court being thus equally divided, the question was left to Mr. Justice Barry, who originally heard the case, and he, after reviewing the whole proceeding, decided that his hon. Friend (Dr. O'Leary) was properly elected. Had, however, the Court of Common Pleas been constituted as it was at present, with three Judges, the majority would have carried the point against the third Judge, and his hon. Friend now sitting for the borough he represented, and proposed sitting for it, would have been unseated. He thought the recommendation made last year on this subject would be acted upon, and that the vacancy should be filled up.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Letter of Resignation of the late Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Ireland."—(*Mr. Butt.*)

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, this was hardly a matter upon which he could give the hon. and learned Gentleman any definite reply, as the appointment of the Judges in Ireland rested not with himself, but with Her Majesty, acting on the advice of the Government. He did not precisely gather from the remarks of the hon. and learned Gentleman what his point was; but he thought his object in calling attention to the subject was to obtain a promise from the Government that the vacancy would not be allowed to continue beyond a certain period. The circumstances of the case would be fresh in the recollection of the House. By the Irish Judicature Bill it was proposed to deal with the number of Judges in Ireland. They had hoped that that measure would have become law this Session. That, unfortunately, had not been the case, and perhaps the hon. and learned Gentleman could explain as well as anybody else why the Bill had not passed? However, though that good fortune had not attended it this year, he hoped it would next year. The hon. and learned Member in calling attention to the matter referred to the duty imposed on the Court of Common Pleas of trying Election Petitions. That was undoubtedly a duty in addition to the ordinary work of the Court, and one which it might be called upon to perform at any period of the year; but it was obvious that that duty was one of comparatively less importance at the present time than it would be if there was any early prospect of a General Election. He confessed that he failed to see from the circumstances to which the hon. and learned Gentleman had called attention any special reason for filling up the vacancy immediately. Although the Court was not up to its full strength it was composed of most able and most fearless men. Their ability, indeed, was such as to entitle them in an eminent degree to the confidence of the Irish public, and he believed the general opinion of them in Ireland would be that they were among the most competent members of the Irish judicial bench. He quite admitted that, owing to the failure of the passing of the Bill to which he had referred, it was unfortunate that the Court must remain for some time longer shorn of its full strength. He only trusted that hon. Members now representing Irish constituencies would be fortunate enough to retain their seats during the autumn and the winter, and that the Court would thus be not called upon to perform any extra work of the kind they had been considering. He trusted they might be able early next Session to give to the subject the attention which its importance merited, so that the present anomaly might not be continued too long.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA: Am I to understand from the statement of the right hon. Baronet that it is the intention of the Government to keep the Judgeship vacant until next Session?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I believe, so far as I know, that is the intention.

DR. WARD said, he believed the general opinion entertained in Ireland with regard to the Judges was very different from that which had been expressed by the right hon. Baronet. On the contrary, it was notorious that, from whatever circumstances, many of the Judges were utterly without the confidence of the general bulk of the population. He referred in particular to Mr. Justice Keogh and Mr. Justice Lawson, the distrust in whom arose from the very circumstances they had been discussing—namely, the trial of Election Petitions. For those Judges, not content with pronouncing their judgments, entered into tirades against those they had decided against, tirades involving large social and religious questions, and they had thereby stripped themselves of the confidence of the people of Ireland.

MR. CALLAN shared most fully in the opinion expressed by the hon. Member for Galway as to the statement made by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. It surprised him very much that a statesman generally so discreet should have made an assertion so rash and inconsiderate. The Judges referred to were able, certainly, and fearless, if audacity could be properly so termed. At the last Election he had the honour of being elected for two places, and he estimated that honour still more because, according to the Constitution, one Petition only could be tried, and he was sure that if his election came before Mr. Justice Lawson, no matter what the evidence might be, he (Mr. Callan) would be unseated.

MR. WHALLEY rose to Order. It was not usual, nor was it desirable, that hon. Members should discuss matters in which they were personally concerned. The hon. Member for Dundalk was personally concerned in this matter, and his case had been properly investigated.

MR. CALLAN: I was not interested, and there was no case tried.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS:—

The House went;—and a Royal Commission to that purpose having been read, the *Royal Assent* was given to several Bills.

And afterwards Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by the Lord High Chancellor (in pursuance of Her Majesty's Command).

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Tuesday the 31st day of October next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Tuesday the 31st day of October next.

PROTESTS.

DIE MARTII, 4° JULII 1876.

SLAVE TRADE BILL.

THIRD READING.

DISSENTIENT:

"Because Clause 1 proposes to enact that which the Law of Nations does not permit—namely, to confer jurisdiction on British Courts of Law over the subjects of Foreign States without the consent of their Rulers, these States being States in alliance with Her Majesty, and bound by certain Treaties, which, however, do not deprive them of the administration of justice, and of other attributes of Sovereignty.

"Because the proposed infraction of the Law of Nations is unnecessary, since the Rao of Cutch, the Ruler of the subjects principally concerned, has signified his readiness to confer the jurisdiction, which it is sought to assume by this Bill, and since the consent of the other Rulers might be, and ought to be, obtained, before such jurisdiction can be conferred upon British Courts of Law.

"STANLEY OF ALDERLEY."

DIE JOVIS, 10° AUGUSTI, 1876.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL.

COMMONS AMENDMENTS.

DISSENTIENT:

"Because no provision is made for hearing of Appeals, either during the Session of the House or after a Prorogation or Dissolution, by any two Peers whom the parties on each side may think competent, and who may be willing to sit in aid of one Law Lord in a case of public or private interest in which they have no knowledge of the parties.

"DENMAN."

APPENDIX.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

The following is a fuller Report of the Speech of the Right Honourable Viscount Sandon, on moving for Leave to bring in the Bill:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 18*th May*, 1876.

Viscount SANDON rose, amidst cheers, to bring in a Bill to make further provision for Elementary Education. The noble Lord said: I hope the kindness with which I have been received is a good omen of the friendly spirit in which this great and important subject will be dealt with by the House. Many of my Friends have asked me whether I was fully aware of the great importance of the subject which I am about to open, and of the risk which Her Majesty's Government would have to encounter in touching it. I can assure those who put the question to me that after the experience I have had during the past two years no one can be more fully alive to the importance and the gravity of the subject than I am; but, on the other hand, remembering the calmness with which it had been treated in 1870, I do not think that the risk Her Majesty's Government will have to run in dealing with it will be very great, and I am satisfied that, on this occasion also, hon. Members on both sides of the House will treat any measure affecting the education of our children in the most careful and most considerate manner, and with the earnest desire to shape it in a form that will best meet the real requirements of the country. I am also quite sure of another point—namely, that the parents of this country will look with disapprobation on anyone who attempts to turn this great question into anything like a Party matter. It is now well understood to be a subject of far too much importance to the interests both of the working classes and of the employers of labour, and to the future interests of the country at large to make people tolerate that it should be treated as a Party question. I, at any rate, shall, on the part of the Government, endeavour to rob the subject of anything like a Party character, and I have a good hope that hon. Gentlemen opposite will aid me in maintaining that spirit of impartiality throughout our debates on the subject.

I should like, at the outset, to lay before the House a sort of picture of the position in which the Government found themselves with regard to education when they looked into the matter with a view to possible legislative action. The Lord President and I have given the question our most anxious, careful, and constant attention for a long period.

We have looked at it primarily in the interest of the children; and, secondly, in the interest of the country as a whole. We have received considerable assistance from different sources in the course of our labours. There is, in the first place, the mass of evidence bearing on the subject which has been collected by the Factories Commission, whose Report has only recently been laid before the House. We have also had the advantage of the judgment of that most able body of Commissioners — whom I must take this opportunity of thanking, on the part of the Government, for the untiring labour, ability, and zeal they have displayed, although I do not entirely concur in all their recommendations. I am satisfied that both sides of the House must be proud of such Colleagues in Parliament as the noble Lord the Member for the West Riding (Lord Frederick Cavendish), the hon. Member for Wigan (Mr. Knowles), and the hon. Member for Roscommon (The O'Conor Don), to whom the country owes a debt of gratitude for their labours on this Commission, and will regret with me that the other Commissioners, Sir James Fergusson and Sir Charles Ducane, are not still Members of this Assembly. We have also had the assistance of the elaborate Report of the former Commission on the Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture. We have had ample opportunities also of becoming aware of the opinions of most of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools with regard to the treatment of the leading educational problems which are now before the country. The measure, therefore, will not fail from lack of information on the subject on the part of its framers. We have, in addition to all this evidence, received an infinite number of communications on the subject from persons of all shades of political opinions, many of whom have great knowledge and experience regarding these matters, and Her Majesty's Government have carefully considered the suggestions which those communications contained. As to the Government measure itself, I wish at once to warn the House that it does not pretend to be a proposal for a general re-construction of our educational system, and further, that it is not intended to be a reversal of the policy of the Act of 1870. The House will, I am sure, agree with me that it would not only be very hazardous, but would also be very wrong, for any Government to attempt to reverse a policy on a leading question which had received the formal approval of the country, unless they had the strongest evidence that the mind of the country, as to that policy, had undergone an entire change. Now that the franchise has been lowered and the system of Ballot has been adopted, the danger is, of course, considerably increased of rapid and violent oscillations in the opinions of the electoral bodies, and it would be most unwise to lead the people to believe that there would be a general reversal of policy whenever there was a change of Government. To propose such a reversal could only be justified on the ground of a great change in the national wish; and, though it would be the height of pedantry to say that if the country came to the conclusion that a mistake had been made by former legislation it should be tied down for all time by the judgment of a past Parliament, still I think there can be no doubt that a Government ought not to propose a fundamental change in the broad lines of a policy adopted formerly by the country and by Parliament on any great subject, unless the nation has made it quite clear that it desires the reversal of its former deliberate judgment. Her Majesty's Government do not propose, therefore, any such reversal as regards the Act of 1870; but they believe that it is their duty to carry into effect what appears to be the deliberate wish of the country, as has been clearly shown by the many discussions on education, both outside Parliament and within its walls, during the last three years—namely, that no child in this Realm should hereafter enter on the struggle of life without being in possession of those simple tools needed by our present civilization to enable him to work his way in later life:—this I take to be the determined and final and settled wish of the whole country, and not merely of any particular section of it.

I know that some people have demurred to this being the real wish of the country, but I think I can test it by taking the case of an individual child. Suppose a child came before a farmer at the Board of Guardians, and that the child was found unable to read or write or to do the simplest sum in arithmetic, would not the farmer speak in the strongest manner of the gross and culpable neglect displayed by the parents of that child? Take the case of an employer of labour in our towns: I doubt if one employer of labour could be found who would not speak in equally strong terms of parental neglect if, when sitting on the bench of magistrates, a child was brought before him totally ignorant of the elements of learning. Take the case of a country gentleman at petty sessions. From my knowledge of those gentlemen I have not the slightest doubt that, if an agricultural child came before him in a state of gross ignorance he would remonstrate strongly with the parent for his disgraceful and culpable neglect. If we should not tolerate a single child being kept in a state of gross ignorance, why should we tolerate whole masses of children being kept in such a condition? To go further, we have had several debates in Parliament on the subject, and Members will recollect that there was a remarkable concurrence of opinion on both sides that the time had come to secure by legislation that a sound elementary education should be universal. It may be said it is all very well to talk in the abstract; but is there any tangible evidence that the country is actually willing to make sacrifices for this object? The evidence, I beg leave to remind the House, is overwhelming on this point. Nothing can afford stronger evidence of the wish of the country to forward any particular object than its willingness to spend money upon it. Well, then, since the year 1839 there has been spent upon school buildings, by voluntary effort, the sum of £13,000,000, of which £8,000,000 were expended before the Education Act of 1870, and to meet this enormous sum of £13,000,000 sterling, only some £1,700,000 has been granted by Government. Then to maintain the schools, putting aside the cost of repairs, &c., the annual Government grant amounts to £1,000,000, a similar sum is obtained from the school fees paid by the parents, and for this object, too, £660,000 is collected annually by voluntary subscriptions.

The result of this expenditure has been to provide school accommodation for the enormous number of 3,150,000 children. Therefore it appears, from whatever point of view you look at the matter, whether you judge from common opinion in the country, from the debates in Parliament, or from the pecuniary sacrifices made on behalf of education, whether by the vast private subscriptions or by Government grant, that the country is in thorough earnest upon this question. I ask the House to look at the manner in which the wish of the country on this subject has been met. There are only two classes of schools which we need take into consideration. First, there are the private adventure schools, which are kept by private individuals for their own profit. These schools are very numerous, and often exceedingly bad. They are kept by people who generally know nothing about teaching, and who frequently have little knowledge themselves. They are often very crowded, they have little discipline or moral or religious training, and are injurious both to the health and the instruction of the children. Then there are the public elementary schools which receive the Government annual grant, and which are obliged to have a Conscience Clause and certificated teachers. There are, of course, another class of schools which are efficient, but which receives no Government money, and are not under regular Government inspection. These for my present purpose may be put aside, because they are comparatively very few, and are year by year diminishing in number. To treat, therefore, the two first classes of schools, which we need only take into account on the present occasion; there has been a large decrease in the attendance at the private adventure schools, and they are now dwindling more and more in most places. The number of private adventure schools in the year 1871 was 6,153; in 1875 the number was 4,849, being a decrease of 1,304. The number of children attending private adventure schools in the year 1871 was 151,955; in 1875 the number was 130,571, being a decrease of 21,384. I hope most of these schools—at any rate, the inefficient ones—will ultimately disappear altogether. Well, then, allowing for these private adventure schools, and going on to the public elementary schools, how do children attend and take advantage of school accommodation now everywhere supplied to them: how do they comply with the wishes of the nation that we should henceforward be an educated people? We ought, at the lowest calculation, to have 3,250,000 children in daily attendance at our schools; whereas we have 1,800,000, so that there remains 1,450,000 to be accounted for. I think we could not account for them in the private adventure schools, even if we granted that attendance at these schools was generally of any real value, and I am at a loss to say where these children are. With regard to the 1,800,000 under instruction, do they get sufficient instruction from their schooling? There, again, I regret to think the figures are not satisfactory. Only 200,000 of them offered themselves for examination in the three upper Standards, and 800,000 for examination in the three lower Standards. I need hardly ask how many of the children passed who offered themselves for examination in those Standards. The result, therefore, is not at all satisfactory as to the schools which have been provided at so much expense for the children of this country. I think I have a right to say that the quiet, sober wishes of the country have been very greatly disappointed in this matter. What sort of education is it that the sober, quiet, right-thinking people of this land wish to be supplied to the children of the working classes? I have not a shadow of doubt that it is the settled sentiment of this country both that sound elementary instruction should be provided even for children of the most ordinary abilities; and, beyond this, that such further instruction should be within reach of all, so that all talent and merit should have an opportunity of rising. This is no novel doctrine. It has prevailed ever since the revival of learning in the time of the Reformation. It is now, I believe, as of yore, the settled wish of the country, and since we have been in Office we have shown our anxiety in the Education Department to meet this wish by the very large improvements introduced into the Code of last year. Assuming, then, that it is the wish of the country that all children of talent should have an open career before them, I think the sentiment of the country with regard to children who have no particular talents—and I believe they constitute the great bulk of children—is that, at any rate, a simple modicum of learning should be secured to them. The kind of education which the country wishes to be given to the great mass of children who have no particular ability or aspirations, was very well sketched by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), who had said—

> "What I would wish to see in this country is that every child should be able to read, and to comprehend what he reads; that he should be able to write, and to write so well, that what he writes can be read; and that, at the same time, he should know something of the simple rules of arithmetic, which might enable him to keep a little account of the many transactions which may happen to him in the course of his life."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxviii. 1289.]

I cannot, while on this branch of the subject, omit to recall to the recollection of the House the earnest desire of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe), when holding the office I now occupy, to secure a solid education for all the children of this country. At a time when people were running wild about fanciful schemes of education that right hon. Gentleman had the courage to say that he wished, above all things, that all children—not only a few picked hot-house plants—should receive the simple elements of instruction. I would ask the House seriously to consider whether it would be right or wise on the part of the State to create, I may call it artificially, by State regulations, a whole population whose great ambition would be merely to wield the pen, instead of the plough or the shuttle, as if the former occupation was necessarily and in the nature of things superior to the latter. I can hardly think that any nation in its sober senses would for a moment lay down that as the object of its legislation; but, without intending it, unwise theoretical legislation might easily have this result, which I am sure the country would greatly deplore, as no one could imagine that it would be for the general advantage of a country that its population should be brought up in the false idea that there is something very superior in using the pen instead of the implements of the mechanic, the artizan, or the farm labourer.

This, then, is the present state of the case: the kind of education which the country wants is ready for all the children of the country. We have schools open for all the children of the country. We have teachers, and in almost all the schools the teachers are well able to give instruction. Everything is there ready except the children to whom we wish to give the benefit of this education.

As the wish of the country is perfectly clear, and the education is perfectly ready for all classes of children that desire it, I should like the House to review rapidly with me, if they do not think I am occupying too much of their time, the present state of the law with regard to the labour and education of children. By the action of school boards under the Education Act of 1870 bye-laws have been passed with regard to the compulsory education of children to a very large extent. At the present moment the children of a population of 10,000,000, out of a population of 22,000,000, are kept from work and are kept in school to the age of 10. They are only free to labour on receiving a certificate of having passed a certain Standard, and they are then subject to a modified half-time system, unless they receive a certificate of having passed another Standard. How is that provision enforced? It is enforced by visits to the homes of the children by attendance officers, who also look after children in all the streets and alleys of a town, by bringing the parents before magistrates, by fines, &c. In the Scotch Act of 1873 the duty of a parent is declared to be to provide for his child elementary instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic from 5 to 13 years of age, unless a certificate be given by one of Her Majesty's Inspectors that the child is able to read and write and has a knowledge of elementary arithmetic. Under the Scotch Act all reasonable fees are paid by the parochial authorities alone, for poor parents who they consider cannot pay them. Further, in England, the Act of 1873 to amend the Education Act of 1870 enacted that the children of out-door paupers from 5 to 13 years of age must go to school, unless a certificate of having passed a Standard has been obtained from one of Her Majesty's Inspectors. I then come to the factories and workshops, putting aside textile factories. No child can be employed under 8 years of age. There is no education certificate required at 8 years; but from 8 to 13 years there must be half-time certificates. In the glass, metal, and fustian trades there are special later ages fixed for the commencement of employment. Then, in mines no child can be employed under 10 years of age; but there is no certificate needed at 10 years; and certificates of half-time attendance are required up to 12 years. Next comes the Textile Factories Act (1874), passed by the present Government, by which no child under 10 years can be employed. No certificate is needed at 10, so that the child may begin to work at 10 in complete ignorance. The child must then continue half-time attendance up to 14 years of age, unless he gets a certificate of proficiency in reading, writing, and arithmetic. It should be noticed that the regulations of children's labour under the various Factory, Mines, and Workshops' Acts, are primarily sanitary; education, as I imagine, being their secondary object. I next come to agricultural gangs, in which no child can be employed under 10 years of age. Then there is the Agricultural Children Act, passed in 1873, but which only began to be fully in operation in 1875. Under that Act no child can be employed under 8, and cannot then be employed unless it brings a certificate of 250 previous school attendances (or six months). After 12 months' labour it must have a certificate of school attendance for another 250 times, or it cannot work under 10 years of age. After another 12 months' labour it must attend school for 150 times, and get a certificate, or it cannot work under 12 unless it has passed Standard IV. This Act is enforced by a fine of £5 on an employer of an uncertificated child. As no one is bound to enforce the Act, it is put in force very partially—in fact, in only some 11 or 12 counties—and in these counties it is generally worked by the police. I have now given the House a sketch of the Acts which regulate the education of children at the present time. I would ask the House to consider what we find, from this review, is the position of the children under the existing law. The great mass of the children now in employment are hampered as to the age at which they may go to work; in many trades the limit is fixed at 10 years, and none can go to work without some certificate of school attendance, or without having passed a certain Standard. Do these Acts give sufficient security that the children of this country go to school or get good instruction elsewhere? I fear not. They illustrate, I think, the English habit of very slow and cautious progress in these matters; and they also read us the lesson that, in all our operations touching these difficult subjects, we cannot be too gradual. But they also give the impression of general confusion, general inconvenience, and very inadequate results. We have, for instance, a school board on one side of a river and none on the other side; and parents may cross the stream and escape from its rules. Again, between the different kinds of labour—that of textile factories, of workshops, and of mines—we have constant conflict and confusion, the employers frequently complaining of the injury inflicted on their various industries by the inequalities as to age and other matters; while, for the parents, nothing can be more vexatious than to find that, on a change of their abode, they are brought under different rules, of which, probably, they have previously heard nothing. Why should a parent, in choosing a particular industry for the employment of his child, be hampered by having to calculate how far his choice would be affected by these conflicting rules? Surely what we want in these matters is, as far as possible, simplicity and uniformity of arrangement.

Let me, then, recapitulate for a moment the state of things at which we have arrived. We find ourselves in the face of a country which has made enormous sacrifices for education; and, while I acknowledge that the employers of labour have made sacrifices, that the country gentlemen have made sacrifices, that the ministers of the various Nonconformist bodies have made sacrifices, I can never omit to bear my testimony to the enormous pecuniary sacrifices which the clergy of the Established Church have made, often from miserably small incomes, made on behalf of education. The ministers of all denominations have done much in that great work, but I still claim the palm for those of the Church of England. Let it never be forgotten that the clergy of England have done all in their power, not to shut the book of knowledge to the working classes, but to throw it widely open to them. By means of the great sacrifices made by these various upper classes of society, with the aid of the comparatively small contribution of the State, schools have been provided for 3,150,000 children; yet these schools are attended day by day by only 1,800,000 children. We are then again brought face to face with the great irregularity which I have before alluded to, and which arises from various causes: it is caused partly by the neglect of the parents, partly by the great value of the children's wages, and likewise often, I have a strong impression, in no slight degree by the absurdly low fees charged in the schools for the excellent education they give, for when the parents see how ridiculously cheap the education is they often treat it as in itself of no value. On the other hand, I find in case after case which has been brought before me from all parts of the country, that where the fees have been raised to a sensible amount there they get a regular and fixed attendance. Looking, then, at the irregularity of school attendance which causes the sacrifices of the country to produce so small a return, I think I have made out a case to show that some further legislation is really needed, and that any Government which does not bring forward some scheme for amending this state of things would be grossly neglecting their duty.

How are we, then, to deal with this great difficulty? There are different modes of treating it. We might propose universal school boards and tell the boards that they must adopt a system of universal direct compulsion by means of universal bye-laws. This, of course, is simple enough in its way. But then we have to remember that, although this proposal has been brought before the House three times, 164 Members is the largest number which has ever been found to vote for it. And even out of these 164 some, whom I may call the leading spirits of the movement, said that they voted for universal school boards with the simple wish that the children might be sent to school, and that they would readily accept any other machinery that was offered in the place of the school board. My right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster) expressed that opinion very strongly; and the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) stated, if I rightly understood him, that, if they could secure the primary object of getting the children to school, he did not care how they attained that object or what schools they had to attend, and expressed no warm feeling in favour of the machinery of a school board. Now, as to universal school boards, the House, I am sure, will not think that I have ever shown any hostility to school boards. On the contrary, on many occasions I have defended their action in regard to bye-laws when I thought them right, and I have lost no opportunity of expressing—what I believe to be the fact —that the country owes a very great debt of gratitude to the gentlemen serving on school boards—whether the country likes the policy of having school boards or not—for their self-devotion to the task of providing schools and getting the children into them in the large towns of the country. They have done a great work; they were called upon by Parliament to do it, and it would be exceedingly shabby, because of a little wave of unpopularity, not to acknowledge their labour to be generally honest and good. But that does not alter the view of the Government as to the very serious danger which hangs around any proposal for creating a system of universal school boards; yet, of course, there may be universal school boards without board schools. But surely no one would think of establishing all over the country so costly a machinery, inflicting everywhere the turmoil, the expense, the animosity of feeling, and perhaps the disturbance, of triennial elections, in order to create what is in fact a new, and a sort of rival municipality, merely for the simple object of getting the children of a place to school. I cannot but think that it will be generally agreed that such a machinery is quite out of proportion to the work it would have to perform, except in the considerable towns. Moreover, we have been told, when a universal system of school boards was urged upon us by the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Dixon), the representative of the Birmingham Education League, that it would not be unreasonable to ask that a board school should be within reach of every parent in the land; that it would not be unreasonable to ask that no Government grants should be made to any schools except those which were under the management of the ratepayers; and also that it might even be profitable to the cause of religion itself, and would not be unreasonable, to insist on all school-board schools being secularized—that is to say, being obliged to banish the Bible and religious teaching from their Time Tables. So that I have surely good cause for expressing my firm belief that if the Government were to propose a universal system of school boards, trying in a feeble manner—because hereafter the restrictions would be easily swept away by fresh legislation—to confine them only to the duty of securing the attendance of the children at the schools, they would be sounding the knell of every voluntary school in the country, and that the proposal would probably lead in the long run to the one thing which I am confident the country would detest and abhor if it was put in black and white before them—namely, one general system of secular instruction. I put, aside, therefore, at once and for ever the proposition of universal school boards as the way of meeting the difficulty. Should we, then, oblige existing local authorities to pass bye-laws for universal direct compulsion? Hitherto direct compulsion has not been enforced in any part of the country, excepting by those who directly represent the ratepayers; that is to say, no locality is under the law of direct compulsion unless at the will of the people of that locality. Direct compulsion means, it may be well to remind the House, laying down by law that every child of the labouring class shall attend school, unless otherwise well instructed, or having a reasonable excuse for absence, for so many hours every week the school is open. To enforce this law direct compulsion means constant visits to the houses and streets where the people live; it means a large body of visitors and attendance officers, who have the duty imposed upon them of going constantly to the parents and questioning them as to the attendance of their children at school. This is what I may call a system of domiciliary visitation. Now, if the people of any particular place wish to put themselves under this system, I have nothing to say against their doing so; but it would be a very serious thing for Parliament to say that, as the law of the land, this system of constant visitation should be imposed upon the people without their consent. I am sure that even hon. Gentlemen opposite cannot like direct compulsion in itself, and can only regard it as a means to an end.

Supposing we were to establish universal direct compulsion and to oblige the existing local authorities to enforce it, is it quite clear that, by accustoming our working classes to this daily supervision and interference at the hands of what must be called Government officers, we might not, as time goes on, be affecting very largely the national character of the English people, who have always prided themselves on their independence and self-reliance, which have been the most essential elements of our national strength? It is not a sufficient argument to say that direct compulsion exists in foreign countries. It may or may not be good for them; but I have always understood that one of the points on which we plume ourselves as a nation is that we are unlike other countries and Races, and are accustomed to be led but not to be driven. Parliament would be, consequently, taking on itself a great responsibility if it decreed that there should be this daily interference with the habits of the people, and that parents should thus be relieved by Government officers of their proper responsibilities. I put aside, therefore, the system of direct compulsion as unsuitable for this country, and contrary to the genius of our people. Supposing, then, we endeavour to solve the difficulty by having one Act for the country and another for the towns, dealing with them separately by Labour Laws like the Factory Acts—adopting, say, the 10 years' limit for town industries, and in the country giving effect to the Agricultural Children Act by providing some authority to enforce it? Well, in that case, we should be creating by law a fresh fatal inconvenience to the employers of labour, and there would follow, as a certain result, the tendency to make children shift from town to country, and *vice versâ*. That system, therefore, would not be a sound one. Moreover, is the Agricultural Children Act of such a nature that the Government would be justified in adopting it as their own? As the House is aware, children under that Act have to be provided with three certificates of school attendance — first at 8 years of age, secondly at 10, and lastly at 12. It is impossible for me, in speaking of this Act, not to give a large meed of praise to my hon. Friends the Members for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) and South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), who in a most gallant manner stepped forward and determined to do their best to secure the advantages of education for the whole of the agricultural children. But it appears to me that Parliament would not be justified in inflicting permanently some of the leading provisions of this Act upon the farmers of the country; and, after all, what should we gain by having two periods of 250 attendances and one period of 150 attendances at considerable intervals of time? Would this plan insure a fair knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic on the part of the children? I am sure the House will agree with me, that this system is not one which ought to be made permanent. There is also a fatal flaw in the scheme of dealing with the question merely as one of labour, because if Parliament does not interfere with the schooling of idle children, parents would have a strong inducement to keep their children from work. Children, then, being neither at school nor at work, would in all probability become bad and mischievous, and that, as the direct effect of legislation. None of these plans, in short, appeared to the Government satisfactory. I therefore put them aside: and I will now run over rapidly the proposals which the Government has to make to the House.

In the first place, I would say that, profiting by the example of the Factory Acts, we intend that our course should be a very gradual one. The Government has looked most carefully into the evidence given by Messrs. Redgrave and Baker before the Factories Commission —who, I suppose, will be acknowledged to be about the best judges of the labour and educational condition of the country — and from considering that full and valuable evidence, we were more than ever impressed with the necessity of dealing with the subject very gradually and cautiously. Our proposals, therefore, will not come to their maturity for five years—namely, till the year 1881. I should also say that all children now 11 years of age would be exempted from the operations of the Bill. As to the school board system, we propose that all localities may in the future have a school board in the same way as they may have them now. We leave the power to set up a school board to the free choice of the locality, and we retain the power in the hands of the Education

Department to oblige localities to have school boards if they do not supply sufficient school accommodation. We propose to repeal the Agricultural Children Act, while adopting certain portions of it. Then, to Town Councils, and Boards of Guardians, on the requisition of a parish, made in the same way as the demand under the present law for a school board, will be given the power to pass bye-laws, just as school boards now can, provide for compulsory school attendance for full or half-time, but they will have no power to establish or maintain schools. The Government, in other words, are of opinion that the representatives of the inhabitants of municipal boroughs—that is, the Town Councils, who are now entrusted with the power of asking for a school board, and, therefore, of enforcing direct compulsion if they like, may very well be themselves entrusted with these special powers of a school board; and that Boards of Guardians, who are now practically the rural municipalities, may well be entrusted with the passing of bye-laws, not on their own spontaneous suggestion, but for any parish in their Union which asks for such bye-laws in the same way as it now asks for a school board. A meeting of ratepayers in a rural parish may at present ask for a school board, and therefore for direct compulsion, and this is the only way under the Act of 1870 by which attendance at school can now be enforced in any part of the country which is not under a Town Council. The Government proposes that this same meeting of ratepayers shall be able to say—"We should like to have bye-laws for compulsion. We ask the Board of Guardians to pass these bye-laws, but we wish to have them without the burden of a school board." So far the whole country would be put on the same footing as to the power to have bye-laws for compulsion. Now comes a more important provision. The House, no doubt, feels that much more is wanted to secure that all children have the advantage of the education now offered to them by our schools. The Government, therefore, propose that no person shall be allowed to take into his employment at all, any children under 10 years of age, under the same penalty as is provided in the Factory Acts, or to take into employment any child of 10 years of age and under 14 years of age without a certificate. This certificate may be of one of two things. It may be a certificate of efficiency in reading, writing, and arithmetic, ascending, in five years' time, to Standard IV., or it may be a certificate of attendance, for 250 times in five previous years in not more than two public elementary schools. The reason for this alternative certificate would be obvious. It is impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that there are a great number of stupid children. If hon. Members will look at the evidence of the Factory Commission they will see that the leading Inspectors have all acknowledged this fact—that in any legislation with regard to education allowance must be made for what they call "dunces." Now this double certificate will have a very important effect upon the education of the children both as to regularity and quality. The parent will not like to risk his child passing in Standard IV. prescribed for children of 10, but he will wish to have two strings to his bow, so as to secure that his child should be able to get out to labour at 10 years of age. He will therefore, in addition, take care that the child makes the necessary attendances for the five years. On the other hand, he will not trust to the 250 attendances in each of the five previous years, because he will fear that illness may come and interrupt one of the necessary sets of attendances in one of the years, and thus the parent will have a strong inducement to push on the instruction of the child, so that he may anyhow, if possible, also secure the standard pass. Thus we believe that the strongest pressure will be put indirectly upon parents by this certificate system to give their children both good and regular instruction. What is wanted is to fix the responsibility of the child's receiving instruction primarily on the parent, with whom it ought to rest; and the whole key of the present Bill is that, instead of its being, as is too often the case at present, the parent's interest to keep the child from school, and to dodge the compulsion officer, in order that he may earn a trifle, the parent's attitude as to his child's education will be completely altered, and it will be, not only his interest to compel the child to go to school, but to question the child as to how he is getting on with his reading, writing, and arithmetic, because, as he will tell the child—"I want the help and support of your labour as soon as you become 10 years old." The effect of this clause will therefore be of the greatest importance, and I repeat again it may be said to be the very key of the Bill. Of course, there must be certain exceptions to the clause. One standard lower would be accepted for a certificate where half-time had been secured under the Factory Workshops Act, &c., Acts, and in any locality where any local bye-laws have been passed which secure the attendance of children at half-time up to 13 years of age. I need hardly say, further, that it will be necessary to accept reasonable excuses such as are to be found in the Education Acts. The clause, for example, will not be enforced on parents or employers where there is not a public elementary school within two miles. Again, out of school hours, or in the school holidays, a child might be employed, as I need hardly say that the Government does not wish to take so unwise a course as to prevent the useful and healthy employment of children, who are attending school, in occasional jobs, which would bring some little gain to the parents and be of use to the community, such a pulling turnips or keeping away the crows, or helping in household work; and the Bill, therefore, will not interfere with their casual employment at any odd times, so long as that employment does not interfere with the proper periods of efficient instruction. The clause goes on to make another exception with regard to the employment of children during the hay harvest, the grain harvest, and generally during the in-gathering of the crops. This is, doubtless, a large exception; but it is a reasonable exception; and I think the House will agree with me that it is most necessary, in order to obtain the result we desire, to avoid anything like pedantry in the treatment of the subject; and it is obvious that the special conditions of agriculture, which make it essential to have labour at special seasons which will not wait for man's pleasure, make it absolutely essential to make particular provisions respecting the population engaged in this great industry. To proceed further—No one can doubt but that it will be a great convenience to the employers of labour if they can simply say, when a child seeks employment from them—"Where is your labour pass?" The employer in that case need not inquire whether a child has passed Standard IV., or whether he has satisfied the law as to the proper number of school attendances. All he would have to say would be, whether in town or country—whether he was a farmer, manufacturer, or any other employer of labour—"Where is your pass?" The question now arises, how is the child to get this pass? It is proposed that the one certificate—that is, that of proficiency—shall be given at the examination by Her Majesty's Inspectors, or by those whom they may depute; and the other—that is, respecting attendance—by the teachers of the schools, and that the State should supply a very simple card such as has been recommended by Mr. Redgrave, upon which should be stated the age of the child, and that this card should be given to him when he has either passed the Standard or has made the proper number of attendances. This will be a great relief to the employers of labour, and especially to the farmers, who would much prefer this labour pass to the duty now imposed upon them, under the Agricultural Children Act, of asking children three times over, as it might be under that Act—"Have you got your certificate?" To forbid all habitual labour under 10 years of age is, I am well aware, a very important step to take. The House will therefore, perhaps, allow me to quote the evidence, which shows the necessity of establishing a general uniform age below which a child should not go to labour. Mr. Redgrave was asked by the Factory Commissioners—

> "Would you recommend a general uniformity of age for commencing labour on any account?" He replied:—"Certainly, including agricultural labour."
>
> "What would be that limit of age?—Ten years, subject of course to exceptions in the case of trades, which I mentioned before.
>
> "What are your reasons for selecting the age of 10?—Because it seems to be the general age which is selected throughout the country."

Mr. Redgrave also stated that children under 10 were little employed in agriculture—

> "As to the question of agricultural labour, your belief is that there are hardly any children employed in agriculture at the age of eight?—The law says eight years of age; but the fact is no children are employed in agriculture at that age. In the Census Returns the numbers are as small as possible.

"They are employed at nine, are they not?—Very few indeed under 10. When Mr. Pell brought his Motion forward I went fully into the question and prepared statistics for Mr. Cross, and I was surprised to find how very few children under 12 were employed in agriculture."

I have also myself inquired very carefully into this subject, and although some children of less age may be desired to be employed in certain manufactures, I believe, and I am confirmed in this belief by the testimony of the Royal Commission as to the Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture, that the best feeling of the farmers and the labourers is at one in declaring that under 10 no children need be habitually employed in agriculture. I now come to the enforcing authority. This will be, in the first place, the school boards, which now exist or which may hereafter be created, and which will have the same power as at present of enforcing more stringent provisions than will be found in the present Bill. They would not, however, be allowed to go below its provisions. The other enforcing authorities will be the Town Councils and the Boards of Guardians, both of which may, if they please, act by committees. The Town Councils will be able to appoint a School Attendance Committee, and the Boards of Guardians may appoint a special committee for the Union, and also, if they please, for every parish in the Union. That is a matter for the local authorities to settle among themselves; but in all the regulated industries of the land—such as factories, workshops, and mines—the Government Inspectors, and not the local authorities, will enforce the Act. It would be undesirable that the employers of labour should be annoyed by the visits of two classes of Inspectors. The Government Inspectors will therefore alone be responsible for the working of the Act in these great industries. The House will, I doubt not, now wish to know what security will be taken that the local authorities shall do their duty in prosecuting the employers of uncertificated children, and in looking after neglectful parents, and neglected children. We propose that the same strong powers shall be taken in regard to the new school authorities, as are now given to the Department respecting school boards, as under the Education Act. The Education Department has the power of declaring the school boards in default if they neglect their duty, just as the Local Government Board has a similar power in regard to Boards of Guardians in certain cases of neglect of duty; and if the provisions of this Act are not carried out, it will be the duty of the Department to see that this should be done by such persons as the Department may choose to appoint and to pay out of the local rates, for a period of not more than two years. The responsibility will then again fall upon the local authorities. Under these circumstances, default is not likely to occur, and I have the fullest confidence that the provisions of the Act will be carried out by the Town Councils and the Boards of Guardians. The Town Councils are well informed as to the wants of their respective boroughs, and no body of men are better acquainted with the needs of their districts than the Boards of Guardians throughout the country. There is still another point of great importance—the case of totally neglected children whether under or over 10 years of age, and of children being under 14 years of age, who do not go to work, nor school, nor are under proper instruction elsewhere, even when they have got a certificate. It may be said that this Bill does not adequately provide for this class, and that, as we do not compel daily direct compulsion, if the parents neglect them, our new school authorities will not look after them. On the contrary, I am not aware of any class of persons more intolerant of the idle, wandering, good-for-nothing class of children than Town Councils and Boards of Guardians. The employers of labour know that these children generally come to no good. The ratepayer looks upon these children as certain hereafter to increase the rates, and the farmer views them as ne'er-do-weels, who rob his orchards and become poachers or tramps afterwards. This is a class of child whose case we are most anxious to meet, and whose treatment under this Bill I will next explain. I hardly know what to call them; I would venture to use—not in the Act, of course, but in the observations I have now to make—the old English term "wastrel." If it appears to the local authorities that the parents of any child who is under the Act prohibited from being taken into employment continued habitually and without excuse to neglect to provide such reasonable instruction as would enable it to obtain a certificate, or if such child was found habitually wandering about, it will be the duty of the local authorities to take certain steps, which I will presently explain. But these children are not to be dealt with unless there is a school within two miles reach, or if the child is kept away from sickness or any other unavoidable cause. But if no reasonable excuse can be given for absence, the local authority is bound to take this action—first, warn the parents of the wastrel children that they ought to be sent to school, or be otherwise instructed, in compliance with the Act; and if the parent does not see that the Act is complied with it is to be the duty of the local authority to bring him before a Court of summary jurisdiction. Here comes in the only direct compulsion in the Bill, and it only comes in on the order of a Court. The Court may then order regular attendance at some school, and a fine of 5*s*. may be imposed. But whether a fine is imposed or not, the local authority may commit the parent, on further default, to an industrial school. [*Laughter.*] I mean, of course, commit the child; I am not sure that it would not do the parent good to commit him. Then we make an alteration with regard to the Industrial Schools Act, which we have been urged to do by persons of great experience in dealing with this class of children. We provide that the managers of industrial schools, on the application of the local authority, may give a licence to the children to leave after one month, instead of 18 months. This has been strongly urged upon us by some of the school boards, which have been very anxious to try, with regard to this difficult class of children—the wastrels—the effect of the temporary seclusion and training of the child in an industrial school without going to the extent of 18 months. The Bill also makes provision that any person may call the attention of the local authorities to cases of neglected children, so as to give a *locus standi* to benevolent persons who take an interest in children, and will be likely to look them up for the local authority.

The method of working, as well as the object of the measure, is now, I trust, pretty clear—we put the whole responsibility for the education of the children in the hands of the existing authorities in the locality, who have not only to carry out this Act, but they are also made responsible for carrying out the Industrial Schools Act, and in this way we hope to strike a greater blow than has been hitherto struck at that class of wandering children who so long have been the despair of those who cared for their welfare.

Now as to the modifications which we propose to introduce, so as to make the measure gradual in its operation and to prevent a sudden shock to the habits of the population. The Act will not come into full operation till 1881. In 1877 children of 9 years of age, and not those of 10, will be prohibited from employment. In that year the Standard which the child will have to pass will be only the Second, and the attendances will only be for two previous years. For safe progress we feel it essential to begin very low, and I would ask to be allowed to strengthen the position the Government have taken up as to the absolute necessity for beginning with a low Standard by quoting from the evidence of Mr. Redgrave, who was asked—

> "Would you not be in favour of some educational standard to be exacted from the child at the age of 10, before he is allowed to go to work as a half-timer?"

He replied—

> "I think you may be able to do that eventually; but, unless you had the very lowest possible standard, you could not do it now."

This is fully borne out by the testimony of other important witnesses, in the Factory Commissioner's Report as to the condition of the people in the great centres of industry. In 1879 and 1880 they will rise to Standard III., and in 1879 the attendance will be required for three previous years, and in 1880 for four previous years. So in 1881 no child will be employed under 10 years of age, and not then without a certificate of having passed Standard IV., or of having made 250 attendances in five previous years. Before closing this part of my remarks, I will point out what is required under Standard IV. It secures that a child can read with thorough intelligence, write small hand, and do the four first rules of arithmetic, and the compound rules as well as far as money is concerned. I think this is a very good outfit for the ordinary child.

I may sum up, then, the great main features of the scheme as follows:—1, school boards as now, if desired or ordered; 2, direct compulsion, full or half time, if desired by the localities, to be administered by existing local authorities; 3, existing local authorities constituted as protectors and guardians of children, and liable to be superseded if in default as such.

There are two or three subsidiary proposals in the Bill which I have now to lay before the House. Those who are aware of the working of Government grants must know that there is one weak point which has been felt, I believe, by hon. Members on both sides of the House. The poorer districts have the least aid given to them. In places like Bethnal Green, where they cannot ask for large fees, and where they cannot get subscriptions, there—however well the children may do—and, happily, in Bethnal Green, as also among the agricultural districts, many children do very well—still, owing to their poverty, the Government grant is cut down. This is a matter that does not affect voluntary more than board schools. The question is one of simple justice, and our endeavour should be to remove so obvious and grievous an injustice. We have tried to find a test which should enable us to decide what is a poor district, and we have looked round to see if we had any precedent to go upon: on considering the Act of 1870, we found there that the definition of a poor district was where a 3*d.* rate on the property produced less than 7*s.* 6*d.* per child, and that in this case an extra Parliamentary grant was made to board, but not to voluntary schools. Again, on referring to the Scotch Act of 1872, we found that where the rate produced less than 7*s.* 6*d.* per child an Imperial grant was made. Looking further into the Scotch Act we found that relief is given to voluntary as well as to board schools in every poor county—such as Inverness, Argyll, Ross, Orkney, and Shetland. We had found, therefore, in those Acts something to guide us as to what had hitherto been considered to be a poor district. We propose, then, to take a somewhat similar standard of the poverty of a district, but we do not intend to go so far as the Scotch Act. We propose that the Parliamentary grant in poor districts shall not be reduced unless it is twice as large as the income produced from local effort. I will endeavour to show the House how this would work. In an ordinary district the State gives £1 to meet £1 from the locality. In poor districts, by this proposal, £1 would be given to meet 10*s.* If a school's maintenance is £120 now, we give £60 grant to meet £60 fees, rates, or subscriptions; but in poor districts for £40 of fees, rates, and subscriptions we should hereafter grant £80. As to the poor districts, how does the Bill propose to mark them out? We propose to take London generally by Unions. In towns above 5,000 population we should take ward divisions, or areas with separate rates, or special divisions suggested by the municipal authorities approved by the Local Government Board and the Education Department. Smaller boroughs would be dealt with as Unions, and the parishes would be the units of the whole country. This is the proposal which the Government has to make on this difficult and important question. We felt bound to try to meet a great injustice. The actual sum of money to be granted will not be very large, but it will be distributed in the poorer parishes where it is most needed.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I am sorry to interrupt my noble Friend, but I do not quite see how the poor districts are to be defined.

Viscount SANDON: Where a 3*d.* rate produces less than 6*s.*

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Perhaps there will be no objection to explain how in places where there are no school boards it is to be ascertained that a 3*d.* rate would produce only 6*s.*

Viscount SANDON: I had, perhaps, better ask the right hon. Gentleman to wait until he sees the clause in the Bill. The point is a difficult one, and the matter is somewhat complicated, but we have tried to face it, because we think there is a real injustice, and there seems to be a precedent to go upon in former Acts. To go on to the next subsidiary proposal, with regard to existing school boards, it is proposed to remove what is believed to be a very great grievance. At present if a by-vacancy occurs in a school board, the locality is obliged to go to the expense of an election; and there is this additional anomaly—that while the principle of cumulative voting comes into operation at the general triennial board election, the effect of it is lost at a by-election, so that a gentleman who wàs elected under it to represent a particular section of the community if he dies has not the chance of being returned at a by-election. [*Laughter.*] That remark was certainly worthy of some of my hon. Friends in another part of the House connected with the sister Island; but, of course, it is understood what I meant—namely, that the party which happens to be in the minority in a place, and which had, at the time of the general triennial election, secured representation by means of the cumulative vote, has not the chance of doing so at a by-election. The cost of a by-election is also very serious, amounting in one town to £1,200 and in another to £1,500. To obviate this outlay and inconvenience it is proposed to follow the precedent of the Scotch Act, which in this particular has, I believe, worked very well, so that a school board will have the power of filling up for themselves a casual vacancy. There is another provision which may be considered a tentative one, and is proposed to be only enacted for five years. We have lately in our provisions respecting education acted solely, I may really say, on the system of forcing parents to send their children to school, and we are now proposing to interfere with the child's labour and earnings unless he is instructed. The scheme which the Government now offers to the House will endeavour to awaken a higher feeling in the breasts of children and parents—namely, that of honour and emulation. I feel strongly that it is most desirable, when we are putting such great pressure upon the people as to their children's instruction, to try as much as possible to lighten that pressure, and to endeavour to excite a higher feeling as to education, and not to be satisfied with merely laying down hard rules, good though they may be, but to appeal to the higher and more elevating motives to which I have just alluded. The plan, therefore, which we shall propose to bring before the House is the following: Where a child takes a double certificate—that is, where a child at 10 years has passed Standard IV. and also has a certificate of attendance for five years—we propose to give it an honour pass. This will be a great encouragement to the more intelligent and orderly child, and this honour pass will give the child a free education for the next three years. This is proposed as a mark of distinction more than a money benefit, and it is supposed that the number who will gain this honour pass will not be very large. All the middle class schools, as well as the great public schools—such as Eton, Harrow, &c.—hold out this sort of encouragement to deserving children, and the Government is of opinion that it is very desirable to do the same for the schools of the labouring class, believing that it will create a sense of emulation and dignity in many of the scholars; and that those who possess a certificate of this kind will occupy a higher and a useful position among those with whom they live, which will be of much service to the national character.

I have now gone through the principal provisions of the Bill, and I desire only to make a few general remarks in conclusion. The country has set its heart on the instruction of the people as a necessity. It has made sacrifices year after year, and yet those who are at the head of the Education Department have to admit that there are more than 1,000,000 of children who are getting no real education at all. Our system has been built up gradually. It has been the work of men of high intellectual attainments and of all shades of politics. It has been built up not only by politicians, but by that remarkable class of men — Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. They are a body of men justly distinguished, not only for the work they have done in their districts, but also for their contributions to the settlement of this question, by the Reports which they have made. The school system has been built up not only by them, but by those in the Education Department, who, though not so well known, most certainly deserve a large meed of public praise. It remains now to put the coping-stone on this great work; but it must be done with caution and care, for if we attempt to overweight the edifice of which others have so wisely and gradually laid the foundation, we may endanger the stability of the whole stately fabric of national education. The Government measure must, of course, stand or fall, as it is approved by the calm and considerate judgment of the House, when they have had the Bill itself before them, But, whatever be its fate, I would confidently claim for it certain qualities: though it is cautious, it is bold, it is comprehensive, it is straightforward. Happy the Government which should be successful in placing the coping-stone on this great work. Happy the political party which accomplishes this grand task! Happy, I would rather say, the Parliament—for this great question belongs to no Party—which, in approaching this grave matter in a sensible and impartial spirit, reconciles the claims of the great industries of the country with the yet more pressing claims of the poor children, and secures for every one of them the blessing of a sound education! I would fain hope that the more the measure is examined the more worthy will it be found of that general support which I have now bespoken for it. But, however that may be, I trust that, anyhow, in considering it the House will bear in mind that it is no trifling matter with which we have to deal, and will never forget that it is of absolute necessity for the future welfare of the nation to get rid of that fatal canker of gross and brutal ignorance which is a disgrace and a shame to our people. While, however, we ought to take every care that the door is kept open to talent from whatever quarter it may arise, I would entreat hon. Members to remember that it cannot be the business of the Legislature, any more than it can be for the interest of the nation generally or of the labouring classes themselves, that by the action of our laws we should lead our people to depreciate the dignity of hand labour. While we hold high the intellectual standard, let us not undervalue the labour of the hand as compared with that of the head. Further, whatever legislation we may adopt, I most earnestly hope that nothing will be done to strike any blow at the religious teaching of the people. I trust, with all my heart, that that will ever remain one of the main features of the education of this country, as it has been in times past, and as I am confident is the almost universal wish of the parents of England. I wish, indeed, I could express more than a hope; but I trust that any proposals will be most carefully watched which might tend to undermine the provisions for religious teaching. Finally, I would say that in this measure Her Majesty's Government has kept this principle steadily in view—that, however great their zeal for education might be, however keen might be their aspirations for the elevation by these means of the condition of the labouring classes, they must take care to do nothing to destroy that self-reliance, that independence, that sense of personal, individual responsibility which in the past has nerved the nation to its greatest successes, and without which we could not hope for that continued vigour which will enable us to command the world in future. The noble Lord concluded by moving for leave to bring in the Bill.

After debate,

Viscount SANDON, in reply, said: In the guarded criticisms which have been passed upon the Bill I cannot help noting an under current of feeling in its favour, and that is, perhaps, more full of promise than an enthusiastic chorus of approbation. The Bill will be in the hands of Members on Saturday or Monday—I cannot absolutely promise it on Saturday, owing to an accident which has befallen the draftsman—and the second reading will be fixed for the 12th June. As to the virtual repeal of the Agricultural Children Act, I have already expressed my sense of the service done by it. My hon. Friends the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) and the Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) are pioneers who have achieved success, and if this Bill pass, it will be partly owing to the work they have done. That Act is, no doubt, in many points a good measure for its purpose, but it is not one that can be expected to be permanent. I would remind the House that the proposal to commit "wastrel" children to industrial schools will only take effect in the last resort. The Bill does not contain any provision for the abolition of existing school boards; if it did, I should have been certain to mention it. I do not see that the honours pass entitling to free instruction will tend to free education any more than Exhibitions and Scholarships at the Universities, in the middle-class schools, and in the schemes of the Endowed Schools Commissioners: and as a matter of fact free education, formerly very prevalent in our grammar schools, has been abolished by means of a system of Exhibitions which is completely ousting the old faulty system of free education, the bad effects of which have been well exposed by Lord Taunton's Commission of Inquiry into the middle-class schools. The teaching of political economy or any other subject in the schools is a matter to be dealt with in the Code. The hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Birley) has made suggestions which are highly valued by the Government. The 10 years of age system will apply to the whole of the country. No existing Act or power of local authority can put the children in a less advantageous position as regards education than they will be in by this Bill; but the Bill will not interfere with existing provisions which put them in a better position, nor will it prevent local authorities making further provisions for education. I think the noble Lord (Lord Frederick Cavendish), who asks whether the provisions of the Bill will extend to Ireland will agree with me that it would be dangerous to undertake an Education Bill for England and Ireland at the same time. In reply to my hon. Friend the Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), I may remark that it would have been unwise of the Government to have introduced fresh legislation with regard to the Agricultural Children Act until it is seen how that recent measure operates. The object of the present measure is to cast responsibility, as far as possible, upon existing local authorities, which will add to their importance, while its effect will be to reduce the cost of getting children into the schools to a minimum. The hon. Member for West Kent (Mr. J. G. Talbot) has referred to the grave and important subject of religion; but the House will see that that is not a matter on which I ought to touch at the present moment. The Government are much indebted to the hon. and gallant Member for South Essex (Colonel Makins) for having sent them a very important scheme, and I am sorry that I cannot now go into the reasons that have induced them, after very careful consideration, not to accept it. The expense of the "honour passes" will be but small, while the proposal will operate very beneficially upon promising children. Should the attempt fail, it will die a natural death at the end of five years. In conclusion, I have to thank the House for the very friendly reception they have given to the measure, and I trust that hon. Members will consider the Bill very carefully as soon as it is in their hands. I can assure the House that Her Majesty's Government will be prepared to give all Amendments which are in harmony with the main principle of their Bill their very best attention. On the whole, I hope we shall be able to pass a measure which will be perfectly satisfactory to the parents of children, to the employers, and to the country generally.

The following is a fuller Report of the Speech of the Right Honourable Viscount Sandon on Mr. Mundella's Amendment:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 19*th June*, 1876.

Viscount SANDON: Sir, I have no cause to complain of the reception the Bill has met with from the House during the two evenings the debate had occupied. I have invited free discussion of its provisions and have promised that all Amendments that are proposed shall receive the fullest consideration. When I introduced the measure I was well aware of the complex character of the work I had in hand, but I was comforted by the reflection that it would not be discussed in a Party spirit. Of course, it cannot be expected at the present moment that the Government should state what Amendments they proposed to accept. I may say at once, however, that the broad features, the general principles of the Bill will necessarily remain unaltered. With the details it is different. Any Amendments which are calculated to make the measure more effective, or to remove any sense of wrong or animosity which may have been created will be willingly accepted by the Government, or at least considered in the most favourable way. It would be highly inconvenient to enter into a discussion as to the details of the Bill, and I will therefore merely refer to the leading suggestions that have been made, and state why the Government cannot accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella). The hon. Member objects to Boards of Guardians being the authority to carry out the Act; but I would ask what other local authority can be found in the country districts? Supposing we decide to create a new Board for the purpose, the same materials as those forming the Boards of Guardians will have to be taken. All the criticisms on that point come to this — Why should not school boards be substituted for Boards of Guardians? I hope, however, the House will agree not to discuss over again the question of universal school boards, considering that this Session, as well as during the two last Sessions, the House has decided by overwhelming majorities on the Bill of the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Dixon), against their adoption. In connection with that subject, I may say I was very sorry to hear the remarks made by the hon. Member for Sheffield with regard to the members of the Boards of Guardians, and especially respecting the *ex officio* members, that is, the magistrates, and the clergy. I think it is a bad omen for our debates on the question, that the first hon. Member opposite who rose to discuss the Bill should have made observations which he knew would touch to the quick hon. Members on this side of the House. I should like to ask the hon. Member who it is that have contributed the money already expended on the education of the people? £13,000,000 have been spent on the buildings and sites of voluntary schools, a considerable portion of which, no doubt, has been spent in the towns, but a very great deal also in the country. Who has supplied those funds, if the country gentlemen, and farmers, and members of Boards of Guardians have abstained from contributing? It is clear that the largest portion must have been subscribed by those very gentlemen whom the hon. Member for Sheffield ventures to speak of as hostile to the education of their poorer neighbours. I trust to hear no more attacks of that kind on the Boards of Guardians. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair) whose remarks I have listened to with respect, said that the proposals of the Government with reference to bye-laws were as weak as water. Well I do not understand that criticism, because the Government has put the local authorities in the same position as that now occupied by the school boards under the Act of 1870. Exactly the same people as got bye-laws passed under the Act of 1870 are to have power to pass bye-laws under the Bill. We think it right to follow the lines of the Act of 1870, and to give the ratepayers the power to assemble and pass a resolution calling on the local authority to adopt direct compulsion. If the present proposal is weak as water, so is the provision as to bye-laws in the Act of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, which is now so much held up to our admiration by hon. Members opposite. The hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Ashley), the noble Lord the Member for the West Riding of Yorkshire (Lord Frederick Cavendish) and the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh have contended that there is no security in the Bill for enforcing instruction in certain cases before or after 10 years of age. That is a serious charge; and if it really is so I confess it would be a great blot on the Bill, for if we forbid all labour up to 10, and then at 10 say to the child—"If you have not reached a certain stage of intellectual instruction you shall not go to labour," we should be doing a very bad turn for the children of the country. If a child spends the years up to 10 in idleness and begins his intellectual instruction at 10, he will be thrown upon the world at 14 with little education and a bad labourer, because he does not begin to toil early enough. I must, however, call attention to the 7th clause, which is intended to be a very stringent one. The intention of the clause is that no child from 5 to 10 shall be able to be continuously and without reasonable excuse kept away from instruction of some kind or other. It is intended, if he is not sent to school continuously—if he is habitually neglected by his parents, that then the strong compulsory powers shall come into operation, and it shall be the duty of the local authority to force the parent to send him to school; and afterwards, supposing at 10 years the child does not get his certificate, the same clause will apply. The clause gives the power of direct compulsion in a way which I believe will be satisfactory to the country, and I trust and believe that all the employers of labour in the country—the merchant and the manufacturer, as well as the country gentleman and the farmer, will join heart in hand with us in seeing that there is no continuous, habitual, and unreasonable neglect, and will also join heart in hand in seeing that no child after it gets its intellectual pass shall be allowed to run wild in the streets, if it is not at labour, but in that case shall have the advantage of continued schooling. Some hon. Members think the Act will not be carried out; but they forget that there is a stringent clause which gives the Education Department the right to supersede any local authority which does not discharge its duty. The Department has the power, if it considers that such duty is neglected, to send down two agents of its own to any locality, to pay them out of the rates, and to keep them there two years, in order to see that the provisions of the Act, as regards employers, parents, and children are strictly carried out in that locality. I should have thought, if there had been any fear about the matter, it would have been that our Bill is too strong. If, however, the words of Clause 7 were proved in discussion to be insufficient, they may be easily strengthened so as to effect the purpose which as I have explained is intended by the Government; but I should have thought there was scarcely a loop-hole through which a child could escape. I have been told that indirect compulsion has failed in the Mines Act and in the Agricultural Children Act. The simple and conclusive answer to that is, that there we had no enforcing authority, but here we have a stringent enforcing authority in the locality backed up by the Department in Whitehall. The hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Dixon) is opposed to several of the leading provisions of the Bill, among others, he says he is against the payments proposed to be made to "poor district" schools. Whether the clause we have proposed will succeed in that respect I cannot at present say. There is extreme difficulty in hitting off what is a "poor district" school, but I adhere to the view that it is unjust, because a district is poor and can get but little local help, that it should therefore be deprived of the Government grant. I think the principle on which I have gone is a sound one. The hon. Gentleman goes on to say that he would gladly accept the local authority proposed, if we gave them all the powers of school boards. That is a very serious change to propose, and I must entirely demur to the proposition that Boards of Guardians are fit to be the managers of schools and to carry out all the work of education. Then there is the solemn threat of the hon. Member, which is a serious matter coming from him—that if the Bill should be carried we must be prepared to have a great agitation throughout the country which would result in the establishment of sectarian schools in every school district. Surely that opens up quite a new view of the case, and different from that taken by the hon. Member in his Bill for universal school boards and universal compulsion. The hon. Gentleman said, in speaking on the 9th of June last year—

> "Let it be clearly understood that, in all those districts where there is a sufficiency of school accommodation, my Bill will have no operation except to enforce compulsion. I only ask that, in addition to what is at present insisted upon by the Act of 1870, school boards shall be formed in those districts where there is already a sufficiency of school accommodation —that is, where voluntary schools, which are mainly Church schools, cover the ground, and where, therefore, a board school will not be required."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxiv. 1572.]

The fact is that the Bill of the hon. Member for Birmingham — supported as it is by the Liberal Party and by the whole of the Nonconformists—proposes to do exactly the same thing, as far as forcing the attendance of children into existing voluntary schools is concerned, only it does it by a different agency, that of school boards, and more stringently, as it necessitates direct compulsion everywhere by means of universal bye-laws: this Bill does not give power to the school boards to build a single additional school, where the accommodation is already sufficient, but it forces children to attend, whatever is the existing school, be it Church, Roman Catholic, or Nonconformist, provided it is a public elementary school — where there is no other school in the place; and yet the Government are now to be told by the hon. Gentleman that the present measure, doing exactly the same thing, only less stringently and through a different agency—that is, the Board of Guardians, is an outrage to the rights of conscience, and that there is to be an agitation throughout the land against its provisions, and that they will be obliged to build unsectarian new schools in every town and village. I cannot understand the position taken up by the hon. Gentleman or by the Nonconformists. I cannot, however, help hoping that wiser councils will prevail, for the hon. Gentleman and his Friends must feel that the measure of the Government is framed in no sectarian spirit. I certainly, in the speech which I made in introducing it, avoided saying anything which could excite the slightest feeling on their part: the Bill itself is drawn up with perfect fairness to all parties, and I contend that the position which they appear to be about to take up is totally untenable. There is another important point which has been touched upon in the course of the debate — I refer to that which relates to the Industrial Schools. So far as they are concerned, the question involved is one which we agree will require a great deal of discussion in Committee. Hon. Gentleman must be aware that when a certain point in compulsion is reached, our action is liable to be absolutely foiled. It is impossible to fine and fine *ad infinitum*, and it is equally out of the question to imprison. The Government are therefore of opinion that some use of Industrial Schools in this matter may be found to be very valuable. It may, however, be matter for consideration, though the Government have formed no opinion on the point, whether some modifications with respect to those schools may not be introduced into the Bill. The truth is that the subject is one in which every alternative treatment possible must be adopted. One mode of treatment will not suffice, and it is necessary that we should have many strings to our bow, because we had to deal with a multitude of evils. Hon. Gentlemen, I may add, on both sides of the House, including the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter), the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Birley), and some others, have made speeches which are highly favourable to the Bill. The hon. Member for Maidstone (Sir John Lubbock) too, though he criticizes some of its provisions, shows he entertains a warm feeling in favour of it, as well as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh. The hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don) has raised a point about which there is considerable difficulty. I can assure him that there is no intention of inflicting a wrong on any denomination, but that I think that the difficulty can be met by insisting that schools which are not public elementary schools, or private adventure shools, shall be allowed to serve for the attendance passes, if they submit to a rigid inspection on the part of the Department. It will, however, be impossible to allow attendances at non-efficient schools to pass. The objection of the hon. Gentleman is one which I quite admit is well deserving of consideration. As to the objection raised by the hon. Baronet the Member for Maidstone, with respect to the attendance, that also I admit will be a great blot on the Bill, if it cannot be met; but I must confess I see no danger of girls slipping out of its meshes. The conditions as to labour will, I think, meet their case as well as that of the boys, as the clause dealing with the matter is believed to be, and is certainly intended to be, very stringent. I regret that the House was not fuller when my hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) made his long and able speech. I cannot sufficiently admire the generosity with which the hon. Gentleman said that he rejoiced that his own Bill should be repealed, believing as he did that that of the Government would be more effective. As there is nobody more conversant with the wants of the country, and nobody more anxious that its children should have education, his testimony in favour of the measure of the Government is most valuable. I will not, however, on the present occasion enter into the details raised by my hon. Friend, nor can I give any pledge on the part of the Government with respect to them. A great number of important matters have also been raised by my right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster), which it would, I think, be on the whole wiser not to deal with at present. There are figures, which I hope to give when proposing the Estimates, but which do not affect the Bill. My right hon. Friend went on to say that he thought I overrated the effect of the Labour Pass. I would remind the House that under the right hon. Gentleman's own Act a child cannot, in the large part of the country where school boards have passed bye-laws, go to work without a certificate; but, at present, the parent alone can be prosecuted, and not the employer who employs an uncertificated child. Surely the new pressure proposed to be added, by prosecuting the employer, will make the present Bill more efficacious. Then with regard to the enforcing authority, I see that the right hon. Gentleman still has a weakness, which I have always suspected, though it has hardly been avowed, for universal school boards. Well, the Government cannot go with him in that direction. That subject must, as far as the present Government is concerned, be considered closed. The Government believe that the proposed enforcing authority represents the people thoroughly, and it surely is over-sensitiveness to say that that authority must in no way be connected with the management of the voluntary schools, a provision which was never even suggested in former Acts, or in the Bill of the hon. Member for Birmingham. If we are to ostracize the managers of all the existing schools in country places we shall be shutting out the best people who care for education, and who are the most likely to get the children into the schools. I will now rapidly run over my objections to the proposals of the hon. Member for Sheffield. The leading point which we have to consider in the proposal of the hon. Member for Sheffield is, whether it is wise to put the whole of our working population into bondage as to the daily attendance of their children, because some of their number are indifferent and negligent. The hon. Member for Hastings (Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth) has supported the proposal by asking why Parliament should not do the forethought for the parents. That is exactly the thing which the Government object to, for they do not think it right or healthy that Parliament should do the forethought for the parents of the country. They hold that to be one of the false principles of legislation, which is doing a great deal of harm in the present day, when Parliament is frequently asked to do the forethought for the people in regard to food, or drink, or morals. The House must not be led by the hon. Member for Sheffield into that most dangerous course. The issue is a broad and clear one. It is not a question of a little more of direct or a little less of direct compulsion. The question is, whether we shall put the honest, laborious, and duty-doing parents into bondage for the sake of the negligent ones. Direct compulsion means that the law shall lay down by bye-laws that so many attendances at school for so many hours on so many days throughout the year shall be compulsory upon all the children of our working population, unless there is a reasonable excuse, that the neglect to keep these attendances shall be held to be a crime, and that the infraction of one of these bye-laws shall subject the parent to fine or imprisonment. The Factory Acts Commissioners, of whom I wish to speak with the greatest respect, made a recommendation of a system of direct compulsion such as hitherto has not existed by law in any part of the United Kingdom. They said that the attendance at school of all children ought to be compulsory up to the age of 13, and they recommended a full-time attendance of five hours daily, or of 25 hours a-week and half-time besides. If, however, this recommendation is compared with the English Act of 1870 and the Scotch Act, it will be found to be much more stringent than anything already enacted. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford states that there are very few children absent from school in places where school boards exist. But the fact is that in London there are something like 180,000 children not in attendance at school, 25,000 at Liverpool, something like 16,000 at Birmingham, and a large deficiency in all other school-board places. I believe, however, that under the proposed system of indirect compulsion the number of attendances will be greatly increased. The Ragged School Union have ascertained that there are a very large number of children in the streets during school hours. When they see the agents of the society taking notes, the children imagine they are school-board people, and rapidly disappear; but when, soon afterwards, a Punch and Judy is sent into the district, the streets swarm with them again. I fear that the accounts about the completeness of the work done by the school boards must be received *cum grano*, and it is at least open to doubt whether the school boards are doing their work, as far as securing the regular attendance at school of the neglected children of our towns, so thoroughly and efficiently as has been stated. Some interesting remarks upon the subject will be found in the Reports of the Inspectors, which will be in the hands of hon. Members in a few days. I myself only saw them a few days ago, after the present measure had been prepared. One of the ablest of the Inspectors, speaking of Gloucestershire and Somersetshire, Mr. Moncreiff, says the action of the school boards has done little or nothing to prevent irregular attendance; and, comparing the country districts without school boards with the towns, he states that the percentage of the attendances in Gloucestershire is to the city of Bristol as 15·6 to 10. Yet the same gentleman admits that the Bristol School Board is one that has worked ably and energetically. Next comes the evidence of Mr. Wilkinson, another Inspector, who is familiar with Staffordshire. This gentleman says that the action of the school boards has in some respects tended to increase the difficulties of education, because parents now seek to send their children only just often enough to avoid being summoned. Direct compulsion, therefore, is not as easy a matter, or as clear a gain, as it is represented to be. Every means should be used for procuring the attendance of the children, instead of confining ourselves to one means, and we should be very cautious in using a direct and vexatious kind of pressure which, in the long run, may retard instead of promoting the end we all have in view. If labourers and artizans are so greatly in favour of education, and of direct compulsion to secure it for their families, as has been asserted in the debate, and by deputations from trades unions and other similar organizations, why do they not vote for it in their several districts by claiming school boards, which can now be done everywhere by the vote of the ratepayers, and why is it necessary in every school-board district to have such armies of visitors to force their children to school? The greatest caution is necessary when we interfere with the poorest of the population, lest by suddenly cutting off the earnings of their children, upon which they in part depend, we should produce a dangerous reaction against the education we seek to give. I am not alone in that view, which is sometimes supposed to be confined to benighted Tories, country gentlemen, or clergymen, who some persons have had the hardihood to say know nothing of these matters. Canon Norris, who for 15 years was one of the best Inspectors of the Education Department, being very familiar with our great centres of industry as well as with rural districts, and being well known as one of those who has been most anxious to promote the most thorough education of the people, is an earnest supporter of indirect compulsion, as opposed to the rough-and-ready system of direct compulsion. In his valuable book, *The Education of the People*, he gives a most serious warning as to the dangers which may be expected from the latter course. I will not apologize for quoting this important passage—

> "When I hear politicians invoking a system of compulsory education as the panacea for all our social evils, I often wish I could take them into one of our poor village homes and let them there try to work out their plan for a single week. Go into any one of those cottages where there are two or three children between the ages of 9 and 12. They are returned in my political friend's statistics as 'idle,' being 'neither at school nor at work.' But what is the fact? They are as indispensable to the home life of that cottage as if they were earning 3*s*. or 4*s*. a-week. One is going errands, most necessary errands, with the father's meals, to the apothecary three miles off, to the village shop. Another collects half the fuel they use, or acorns for the pig, or manure for the garden, and all in their turn 'mind the house,' 'mind the fire,' 'mind the baby while the mother is out.' We must think twice or thrice before we roughly try to apply compulsory school attendance to such a home as that. To require those parents to give up their children's services would be simply tantamount to requiring them to keep a servant girl at a cost of 2*s*, 6*d*. a-week, out of an income of 12*s*. a-week."

The late Prince Consort, also, whose calm judgment, as well as zeal for the elevation of the people, gives his opinions the greatest weight, treats the same topic with similar words of warning in 1857—

> "What measures can be brought to bear upon this evil (of non-attendance at school) is a most delicate question, and will require the nicest handling, for there you cut into the very quick of the working man's condition. His children are not only his offspring to be reared for a future independent position, but they constitute part of his productive power, and work for him for the staff of life. The daughters especially are the handmaids of the house, the assistants of the mother, the nurses of the younger children, the aged, and the sick. To deprive the labouring family of their help would be almost to paralyze its domestic existence."

Such an opinion, coming from one intimately acquainted with the domestic life of Germany, and with its school regulations, is well deserving of consideration. As to the course which the Government intend to pursue respecting the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sheffield, I must say plainly that the Government once for all decline to put the labouring population in leading strings as to the daily life of their children, and therefore must oppose this Amendment which we consider fatal to the principle of the Bill. In various other ways the Bill may of course be amended. It may be desirable to put in some declaration of the parent's duty, though general declarations of that kind appear almost surplusage in the face of the Preamble. If the House will consider the Bill as a whole, they will see that it completely alters the position of all parties towards education, as far as their personal interest is concerned. Now, the immediate interest of parents and employers is against the school: hereafter, it will be turned in its favour. The negligent parent, who now keeps his child at work, instead of sending him to school, will find that in order to get him to work and secure his earnings he must have sent him early and regularly to school, The employer who now tries to get the child to work for him, regardless of his instruction, will find that he cannot get his coveted services unless he has been early and regularly instructed, so that his interest will hereafter turn his influence in favour of the child's schooling. That surely is no unimportant change in the attitude of those who are set over the children which must follow from this Bill, by which a more important agency than an army of attendance officers is enlisted in favour of the children's education. To sum up the provisions of the Bill, every locality, as at present, can still have a school board, with all its existing powers, if the ratepayers vote in favour of having one: existing school boards are not interfered with, but will be kept exactly as they are, with the same functions, but with the enormous assistance of indirect compulsion. Local authorities everywhere will be armed with the power of protecting children from the negligence of parents or the pressure of employers. Then a strong pressure will be kept on the local authorities themselves, through the power of the Education Department to declare them in default if they do not do their duty, a power which may be set in motion by Her Majesty's Inspectors or by other complainants. Then there is direct compulsion if the locality desire it, just as in the case of school boards at present, and, again, there is the Labour Pass. And next we have the very strong clause which deals with negligent parents and wastrel children. Well, then, we have surely got great simplicity of working in the Bill. All the parent has to do when he wants to send his child to labour is to present a pass, and all the employer has to do is to ask whether the child has got one, for as the child's age will appear upon it there will be no further difficulty. As to the Labour Pass, we have the Dunce Pass, the Standard Pass, and the Honour Pass; and in that way emulation among the children—a most important motive power—is amply provided for. Very little persuasion will therefore after a time, I believe, be necessary to induce the child to attend regularly and do its work well. Another wider advantage of the measure is the concentration of duties upon existing authorities, as the Government is strongly of opinion that it is most undesirable to multiply local bodies, but that it is of the greatest importance, with a view to the efficiency and dignity of those already existent in every locality, as well as with a view to economy of administration, that the responsibility of all the public business of a locality should be as far as possible placed upon those who are already charged with a principal portion of it. Another point of importance is, the probable effect of the Bill upon private adventure schools, which are in many cases a great evil to the children, being unhealthy, and conducted too often by those who have no idea of moral discipline, and have no instruction to communicate to the children; these I think I can show will be very quietly, and almost insensibly got rid of. For the parent will not send his child to a school where he will not get sufficient education to pass the Standard, or where attendance will not count, as he will be unable to secure the Labour Pass for his child; so that it appears almost certain that parents will withdraw their children from all private adventure schools, except from those which are so good that they will secure the child getting the Standard Pass—and with such schools I should be most unwilling to interfere, as they will give variety to our system, and suit the various tastes of different grades and classes in the labouring community. Lastly, I claim as one great advantage of the mode of treatment proposed by the Government Bill, that the great re-action, which authorities far higher than my own had grave fears might set in amongst our working classes against our educational system, will be avoided. ["No, no!"] Yes, direct compulsion has been pressed as far as it can; people are beginning to rebel against it, and unless by this measure we anticipate the growing dissatisfaction, that dissatisfaction may prove dangerous. Theorists may consider the measure illogical, half-hearted, insufficient. These are some of the epithets hon. Gentleman opposite think fit to apply. Members of the Birmingham League may entreat me to take courage and do their bidding; extreme friends of Voluntary Schools may entreat us to take courage, do their bidding, and repeal the Act of 1870. Courage to do the bidding of either party I should consider not courage, but fatal rashness; for as to taking courage to do the bidding of the League, all the electors throughout the country have told the League that the country is not with them, and as to taking courage to comply with the entreaties of my hon. Friends who take an opposite view, there is no sufficient sign that the country is with them to justify any Government in taking up the conclusions they advocate, and in proposing to reverse the leading features of the policy deliberately adopted in 1870. The Government, in my opinion, may rest with confidence upon their measure while they have the good opinion of such men as the hon. Member for Berkshire, the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh, and my hon. Friends the Members for Manchester, Exeter, and Norfolk, who have all acknowledged the vigour and value of of this Bill; as it has been acknowledged in many other quarters. If the Bill is that weak and inefficient measure which some people pretend, why does the hon. Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard) say it is going to occasion a revolution? I admit that though strong and comprehensive, the measure is cautious and moderate. I, for one, charged with the responsibility of the Department to which I belong, should be sorry if I brought forward a measure which was not cautious, and which did not err, if anything, on the side of moderation, when I know the enormous interests at stake. It is to the sober sense of Englishmen to which the Government appeal. It is not to the theorists, to the Members of the Birmingham Education League, or to the extreme partizans on either side of the House that we offer this measure. Such views we do not seek to embody in it, and such opinions we can neither hope, nor wish to conciliate; but we offer this measure to the sober moderate men of all parties, as one which, while consistent with the freedom of individual Englishmen, and interfering as little as possible with honest industry, will show no mercy to that grievous wrong-doer who injures his child by depriving him of the education to which he is entitled, and will in a few years secure that great object upon which the country has set its heart—that none of her children shall be deprived of the blessing of a sound and good education.

The following is a fuller Report of the Speech of the Right Honourable Viscount Sandon on Mr. Richard's Amendment:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 10*th July*, 1876.

Viscount SANDON said: The debate has now lasted for a considerable time; though, in the early part of the evening, it seemed so much to flag that I was apprehensive the whole matter would come to a premature conclusion. I do not, therefore, think that I am rising too early to address the House. During the first two or three hours of the debate, I felt disposed to regret the tone which has been adopted by more than one speaker. I have, during that time, heard a good deal which seemed to indicate that religious feuds and bitterness would be introduced into the discussion; but when I was beginning to feel injured and annoyed by these attacks, I reminded myself that one was bound to admit that, after all, Nonconformists had real wrongs in the past to complain of, and that Churchmen therefore ought not to be too sensitive now if —even at the present day—when those wrongs were long ago removed, those who belonged to the older generation of Nonconformists should still be very susceptible when they approached a subject such as that before the House, and should be over anxious and suspicious if they fancied—however much they might in fact be mistaken—that some former wrong might be revived, and the least invasion made upon their rights and liberties, the maintenance of which all parties alike would now cordially support. For my part, I must confess I wish we could forbid the reading of Catechisms of any kinds in our debates; for their frequent reading in recent discussions has, in my opinion, neither tended to the dignity of those debates, nor to the promotion of that good feeling which ought to prevail. But if there were some speeches in the early part of the evening to which I could not listen with satisfaction, there were others later on, full of grave and serious arguments —such as that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Hants (Mr. Cowper-Temple) and that of the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) who has just sat down—which will, I think, do good service to the cause of education; for, while they entered fully into the supposed grievances of the Nonconformists and carefully weighed them, they came to the conclusion, with the Government, that those grievances are only imaginary. I may also observe that I have received several communications from various parts of the country, in which I am informed that such denunciations of the proposals of the Government as the House has on more than one occasion heard are by no means acceptable to the great mass of Nonconformists. Now, there are two or three points which have been raised by the hon. Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard), the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. M'Arthur), and others, to which I wish to advert before entering into the general argument. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Merthyr has spoken of it as one of the great grievances of the Bill, that under its operation Nonconformists will be excluded from all share in the teaching profession; but surely he forgets that there are, at the present moment, 2,000 British schools, besides 1,100 board schools, in which I cannot but think that Nonconformist teachers, even if they are excluded from Church of England schools, will find ample room for exercising their powers. Then the hon. Member said there were thousands of schools supported only by fees and Government grants. [Mr. Richard: I beg pardon, I said "some schools."] I wrote down the hon. Member's words at the time, but, of course, I accept the hon. Member's retractation. But it is still desirable, after what has passed, to give the figures. There are 315 schools supported only by fees and the Government grant—of which 130 are Church of England schools; 180 British and Wesleyan schools; and five Roman Catholic schools —that is to say, 1·38 Church schools were so supported; and 8·85 British and Wesleyan. That is an important figure, which ought to be borne in mind after the somewhat rash and sweeping assertions which have been made. Then the hon. Member said that £14,000,000 had been spent by Government upon the maintenance of voluntary schools; of course, by this, he means under the annual grants, from the beginning of such grants in 1839; but he ought, in fairness, not only to have mentioned also the annual voluntary subscriptions given during the same term of years, but he ought to have mentioned the enormous sum of £13,000,000 sterling spent by voluntary effort on the sites and buildings of these schools, while Government had only given less than £2,000,000. Surely, the hon. Member is not ignorant that even amongst his own friends, and also on his side of politics, there are many differences of opinion as to the desirability or otherwise of Boards of Guardians becoming the managers as school boards are of schools, and against the view of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, I set the representations made to me by recent deputations from the trades unionists of London and from the Union of the Agricultural Labourers, who protested against these bodies being the managers of the schools, and said that in their opinion they were quite unfit for this special office, and seemed much relieved when I showed them that such an arrangement was not in the Bill, and was not supported by the Government. When the hon. Member has settled this point with his friends of the working classes, I shall be happy to discuss it further. The hon. Gentleman said he was now very doubtful about compulsion, and thought it better to leave the question of the attendance of children at school to the general good feeling of the people; but on looking at the Division List upon Mr. Dixon's Bill last year, when we were specially and repeatedly told by Mr. Dixon, and the supporters of the Bill who sat all around the hon. Member for Merthyr, that universal school boards were not a necessary part of the Bill, but that the real question at issue, upon which the opinion of the House was challenged, on account of which the most urgent appeals were made to us to read it a second time, was universal direct compulsion, I find the name of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil as voting for the Bill. I am the last person in the world to blame any one for a conscientious change of opinion; but this was a very remarkable change indeed, most rapid and unaccountable. The hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. Jenkins) assured the House that the labourers would not consent to any measure to compel their children's attendance at school, if administered by Boards of Guardians—that, in fact, they would regard it as an insult. From Labourers' Unions and their friends, however, a very different story comes. The hon. Member forgets that I have had communications from these associations myself, and have discussed personally with them all the leading provisions of the Bill, so that I can give him authentic information as to their views—quite contrary to the hon. Member's account, they asserted that they were so eager for education that they represented to me that the Government scheme of compulsion was much too moderate. In comparing denominational and board schools the hon. Member for Dundee was not more fortunate, for Returns show that the average attendance is higher in voluntary schools than in board schools; and though it is true that the latter excel somewhat in writing and arithmetic, still their position is certainly not one of general superiority to a great portion of the voluntary schools, even in intellectual matters, putting aside the important questions of morals, training, and management. The assertion that board schools were cheaper than voluntary schools is as unfounded as the sweeping statement that they were more efficient; for, while the average cost per head at a Church of England school was £1 11*s.* 11½*d.*, at Wesleyan or British schools £1 12*s.* 2½*d.*, and at a Roman Catholic school £1 9*s.* 5*d.*; the average cost of a board school was £1 16*s.* 11*d.* A great part of the hon. Member's argument was based on these two points, and on the strength of them he appealed to the Government not to occasion any shock to the school board system. The arguments upon which he based his appeal, as I have shown, come to nothing; but I can assure him, as I have said throughout, that the Government does not aim at destroying the school board system, as he would have seen if he had studied the Bill more carefully. We have left people free to have school boards if they like. But once more, and before parting with the hon. Member's remarks, I must again remind him that as to board schools being cheaper and more efficient than others, there is not a particle of evidence. The hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. M'Arthur) said the Conscience Clause was often shamefully broken; but there, again, no evidence whatever was offered; it must be borne in mind that changes in the Time Table do not mean at all necessarily changes affecting the Conscience Clause. A simple transposition of the hours of lessons was, of course, not seldom made which had nothing to do with an infraction of the Conscience Clause. So many watchful eyes are looking out for any breaches of the Conscience Clause in our schools, that I cannot but think that those that take place are generally made known to us by the newspapers, or by letters to the Department, and, so far as the public and the Department know, the cases are, I am happy to say, certainly very few—so that, lacking further proof, I say this attack of the hon. Member falls to the ground. The hon. Member then sneered at the agricultural interest, and spoke of the intense ignorance of the agricultural children; but it has been found by the Education Department, as I have repeatedly informed the House, that the country children attend school longer and better than those in towns, and that they pass better than the average in towns. [Mr. A. M'Arthur denied that he had sneered at the ignorance of the agricultural children.] Well, if the hon. Member did not sneer at agricultural children, his whole tone and argument in regard to them was most decidedly and unmistakably depreciatory, in comparison to the town children. But the real point to be decided by the House now is, whether we are or are not to assent to the proposal of the hon. Member for Merthyr. In introducing the Bill I said that the Government had kept steadily in view, as the main object of the measure, the advantage of the children of the country, both individually and in their more public capacity as future citizens of this great Empire. That is the point of view from which the question ought principally to be looked at: this is the test which the Government applied to the various proposals which they had before them in framing the Bill, and this test I would beg the House to apply to this proposal, and to any others which are brought before us. When the hon. Member for Merthyr asks us to decide that all schools should be hereafter under public management, I would ask the House, before assenting to this proposition, to consider what you really want your schools to be, where the children of the working classes will to a great extent be obliged to spend all the time which they have available for education. Do you desire the children to go to simply elementary learning shops, where they will pick up nothing but the bare elements of an elementary secular knowledge? I have not a doubt that the country wishes that the schools should not only be thoroughly good places for imparting to children elementary knowledge, but also, and above all, good training places for their characters and morals. The country wishes before all things to have schools of this latter kind. I cannot have the least doubt about this; I see this is the ruling feeling as to our schools amongst all classes and Churches in every part of the land. Now, the question is, how is this kind of education to be secured? Is public management the best way to secure and maintain the high character of our schools as training places for the young? The only public management of which we have had any practical experience is the school board system, and, however much we may approve of their zeal in building schools, and of their judgment as well as energy in getting children to attend school, anyone who has studied their working is aware that the management of their schools is their weak point, even under the guidance of such excellent members as have generally in the first instance been elected. It is, however, I fear, more than a matter of serious doubt whether we can rely on as good men joining the school boards in future, merely to undertake the drudgery of managing board schools, when the more interesting work of providing schools, and of inaugurating a new system is over. For it must be remembered that even with the advantage of a better class of men than are likely to join them in future, many school boards up to the present have not worked well. If hon. Members will read for a few weeks the reports of their meetings in *The School Board Chronicle*, and would study the annual Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of schools in the Blue Books—let them look, for instance, at the recent ones respecting Cornwall, Essex, and Suffolk, and others — they will see that their working is far from satisfactory, as far as education is concerned, in no insignificant number of cases. As far, therefore, as practical experience goes, it is, to say the least of it, doubtful whether elective bodies are the best managers of schools —that is, whether the children's advantage will be as well secured under their management as under that of private managers, who have hitherto maintained a high tone in the schools of England. A curious Return as to the management of schools by school boards has been laid upon the Table this year—I think on the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for West Kent (Mr. J. G. Talbot). There were, at the date of the Return, 874 school boards in England and Wales, and yet only about 160 of them had appointed managers for their schools. These 874 school boards had 1,754 schools of their own, and for the 1,541 of these schools which are attended by girls only, 46 school boards only have appointed lady managers to the number of 256. Hitherto the successful management of our girls' schools has been very much due to the ladies of this country; but when it is found that so few of the school boards have appointed lady managers, this fact alone must suggest another doubt as to the fitness of popular bodies for these functions. Again out of this large number of 874 school boards, with 1,754 schools, only 407 have arranged for the systematic visitation of their schools, either by themselves or by managers. Thus we have before us this picture—in many towns the schools left entirely in the hands of the schoolmasters and schoolmistresses; in many cases very young persons, who, however excellent as teachers, can hardly be considered fit for this grave and difficult task, without the help of experienced managers. Then let us look at Birmingham, which is supposed to be a remarkable town in all educational matters, which has gentlemen of undoubted zeal for education on its board, and which prides itself on being in advance on this subject, I find that its school board has appointed no managers to its schools. Further, from a report in *The School Board Chronicle* of the proceedings of the Birmingham school board, which I hold in my hand, I learn that an inquiry was made of each member whether they could arrange among themselves for the systematic visitation of their schools, which have, as I have shown, no managers, and they expressed their regret that they were too busy to do so; and so the schools, so far as my knowledge goes, are left without any systematic management or visitation. As compared with this picture, surely experience has shown that the management of the voluntary schools has been, for the most part, one of their special advantages. People who really care for education and for the children, and who make sacrifices of time and money for the cause, control them. The result has been that voluntary schools have been particularly good in regard to the moral character of the children. Compare them with the best accounts of the American and the German schools, and I believe the English voluntary schools will be found to bear the palm for good influence over the children, the great point upon which the country is primarily anxious. Therefore, as far as the advantage of the children themselves goes, I think any impartial judgment must confess that that private management carries the day.

But to put this aside, is there some overwhelming injustice proposed to be created by this Bill which should make us overthrow a system which we nearly all agree is the best for children? Has the Conscience Clause really failed? I have looked at the Inspectors' Reports, Report after Report, and certainly the only conclusion I can draw is that it has not failed. Whenever the public Press —and it is watchful in this matter—or letters from individuals, bring to the notice of the Department the least case of infraction of the Conscience Clause, we send down a peremptory order to stop the wrong, under pain of the loss of all the Government grant. But it has been said that the Conscience Clause has a very small operation. Well, last autumn I wanted to ascertain whether it was much used or not, and I sent a circular from the Department to all board and voluntary schools—and what was the result? Why, I found from the answers made to this circular, that under this much-maligned Conscience Clause, the effect and value of which it is now the policy of the hon. Member for Merthyr to deride, a total of over 3,300 children have been withdrawn from religious instruction. That is to say, out of 8,586 public elementary schools of the Church of England, scattered all over the country, there were withdrawn from religious instruction 1,446 children; out of 1,755 British, Wesleyan, and undenominational schools, 249 children were withdrawn; out of 528 Roman Catholic schools, 1,325 children were withdrawn; while out of 1,319 board schools 358 children were withdrawn. This surely shows that the Conscience Clause has not proved nugatory, but has, to a large extent, done the work it was intended to do. I will not dwell on the religious difficulty; but I must say I think that this evening's debate has shown that it is the general opinion of both sides of the House that this difficulty is not a real and serious one, and, anyhow, that this Bill in no way increases or creates such a difficulty. Granting, for the sake of argument, that a religious difficulty does exist, I would ask why was it not started when Mr. Dixon brought forward his Bill? Mr. Dixon stated over and over again that his Bill was one for universal direct compulsion, but that it contained no provision whatever for setting up new schools where they already existed, according to the requirements of the Department. Why was not the religious difficulty mentioned then? Well, then, I would again ask, has the Government Bill aggravated the religious difficulty in any way? Perhaps the best answer I can give the House to this question is to quote from the printed circular which was forwarded to me at the Privy Council Office. It was marked private, but I presume that I may use a printed document coming to me in my official capacity, and I will appeal to this circular as containing the most trustworthy information as to whether the Government Bill really aggravates any supposed religious difficulty. It was written after reading my speech on introducing the Bill, before it was printed, but it goes minutely into details and shows that the writers fully understood the main features of the Government scheme, and it specially states that no power, like that of school boards, is given to the new school authorities to establish schools, and that they are obliged to compel attendance at the existing schools. This document is dated from the Central Nonconformist Committee, Birmingham, and I will, with the permission of the House, read an important passage—

> "The effect of these proposals will be to introduce both direct and indirect compulsion into many parts of the country where Nonconformists are numerous, but where the only schools in existence are schools connected with the Established Church. The Committee (the Central Nonconformist Committee) feel strongly the injustice which is involved in compelling the children of Nonconformists to attend schools which are established with the avowed intention of educating children in the principles of the Church of England, and which are under the almost irresponsible control of the clergy. But practically the injustice already exists. It is one of the inevitable evils resulting from the denominational system. Nonconformists of every description are anxious to give their children as good an education as possible; but in many parts of England they have no choice of schools. They are obliged to send their children to the schools of the clergy or to leave them uneducated. We believe, therefore, that the number of Nonconformist children who are not actually at school, and who would be driven into Church schools by Lord Sandon's Bill, is extremely few. The children whom the Bill would reach are for the most part children of ignorant or careless parents, and it is better that they should be driven into the school of the Church than that they should receive no education at all. While, therefore, we recognize the strength of the abstract objection to the compulsory proposal of the measure, we cannot recommend that these proposals should be resisted. In the interest of the neglected children and of the country at large, we think that they should be accepted.—Signed by William Middlemore, J.P. chairman; R. W. Dale, H. W. Crosskey, J. Jenkyn Brown, hon. secs.; F. Schnadhorst, secretary."

This is surely remarkable and unimpeachable testimony; it comes from the very heart of the operations of the League; it is the deliberate utterance of their well-known political Association —the Central Nonconformist Committee

—which is held to be the mouthpiece of the most extreme and active sections of the three leading Dissenting communities, and is signed by the well-known leaders of their party. If I wanted an argument to show that the Government Bill is one of perfect fairness to the Nonconformists as well as to the Church, I might well be content to rest my defence upon this important circular which has been forwarded to me.

But to go back to the hon. Member for Merthyr's Amendment, it is as clear as the day that it is not really the question of whether it is a good thing or not for the children that the schools should be under public management. It is the old, old story which the House has heard and has rejected so often before, ever since 1870, that a board school should be put within the reach of every Nonconformist parent. Yes, the real meaning of the Amendment is simply the plan which Parliament has so often refused to adopt, that the voluntary schools should be thrown on the rates—a proposal which I can hardly fancy the Nonconformists or any politicians will find a very profitable one to suggest to the ratepayers — and then that Parliament should create universal school boards. This, however, is a proposal which the Government cannot entertain for one moment. I regret, in the interests of education, that the subject should have been brought forward again; but I trust that the calmer judgment of the hon. Member for Merthyr and his Friends, when they have thought over the Bill, will lead them to adopt what I believe to be the opinion of many of the most considerate Nonconformists throughout the country, that it has been framed in no sectarian spirit whatever, and that it will promote the great cause of education without inflicting any injury upon the consciences of any of our people. However this may be, I confidently claim for Her Majesty's Government that, while we have tried to utilize and strengthen existing institutions instead of setting up new ones, and while we have endeavoured to avoid making great and sudden changes in the daily habits of our people, which would inevitably set them against education, we have framed our measure in the honest desire to make the best, the soundest, and the most complete provision for the education of our children, who must in the course of time be the citizens and subjects of this great Empire, and influence to a great extent its future destinies. I trust for these reasons the House will not accept the Amendment of the hon. Member.

A

TABLE OF ALL THE STATUTES

PASSED IN THE THIRD SESSION OF

THE TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

39 & 40 VICTORIA.—A.D. 1876.

PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS.

1. AN Act to raise the sum of Four million and eighty thousand pounds by Exchequer Bonds.
2. An Act to apply the sum of Four million and eighty thousand pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six.
3. An Act to extend the Time for the Epping Forest Commissioners to make their Final Report.
4. An Act to apply certain sums out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the years ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six, and one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven.
5. An Act for enabling a further Sum to be raised for the purposes of the Telegraph Acts, 1868 to 1870.
6. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Stamping of Policies of Sea Insurance.
7. An Act to amend the Law relating to certain Appointments to the Council of India.
8. An Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better payment of the Army and their Quarters.
9. An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on shore.
10. An Act to enable Her most Gracious Majesty to make an addition to the Royal Style and Titles appertaining to the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom and its Dependencies.
11. An Act to amend the Act of the Seventh and Eighth Years of Her Majesty, Chapter Forty-four, relating to the Formation of quoad sacra Parishes in Scotland.
12. An Act to assimilate the Law of Scotland to that of England respecting the creation of Burgesses.
13. An Act to prevent the Administration of Poisonous Drugs to Horses and other Animals.
14. An Act to extend the provisions of the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act, 1866, to the Accounts of the Commissioners for the Government of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea.
15. An Act to apply the sum of Eleven million pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven.
16. An Act to grant and alter certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue, and to amend the Laws relating to Customs and Inland Revenue.
17. An Act to amend the Partition Act, 1868.
18. An Act to incorporate the Solicitor for the affairs of Her Majesty's Treasury, and make further provision respecting the grant of the administration of the Estates of deceased persons for the use of Her Majesty.
19. An Act to amend the Law relating to Salmon Fisheries in England and Wales.
20. An Act to facilitate the Revision of the Statute Law by substituting in certain Acts, incorporating Enactments which have been otherwise repealed, a reference to recent Enactments still in force.

21. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Qualification of Jurors in Ireland.
22. An Act to amend the Trade Union Act, 1871.
23. An Act to amend the Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871.
24. An Act for the Relief of the Executors of Testates in Scotland where the Personal Estate is of small Value.
25. An Act to amend the Law in Scotland in regard to the division of Burghs into Wards.
26. An Act to assimilate the Law of Scotland relating to the granting of Licenses to sell intoxicating Liquors to the Law of England.
27. An Act to authorise the Reduction of Local Light Dues.
28. An Act to amend the Court of Admiralty (Ireland) Act, 1867, and confer a more extended Admiralty Jurisdiction on the Recorders of Cork and Belfast.
29. An Act for the Preservation of Wild Fowl.
30. An Act to amend the Settled Estates Act of 1856.
31. An Act to grant Money for the purpose of Loans by the Public Works Loan Commissioners, and to amend the Public Works Loans Act, 1875.
32. An Act to amend the Friendly Societies Act, 1875.
33. An Act for the Amendment of the Trade Marks Registration Act, 1875.
34. An Act to amend the Law relating to Elver Fishing.
35. An Act for consolidating the Duties of Customs.
36. An Act to consolidate the Customs Laws.
37. An Act to assimilate the Law in Ireland to the Law in England as to quieting Possessions and Titles against the Crown.
38. An Act to extend the Limits of Age up to which, with the assent of Boards of Guardians, orphan and deserted pauper Children may be supported out of Workhouses in Ireland.
39. An Act to continue certain Turnpike Acts in Great Britain, and to repeal certain other Turnpike Acts; and for other purposes connected therewith.
40. An Act for enabling legally qualified Medical Practitioners to hold certain public Medical Appointments, and for amending the Medical Act.
41. An Act to remove Restrictions on the granting of Qualifications for Registration under the Medical Act on the ground of Sex.
42. An Act to amend the Law respecting certain Returns from Convict Prisons.
43. An Act to make provision respecting the Superannuation Allowances or Pensions of Persons employed in the Service of Her Majesty in the Government of the Isle of Man.
44. An Act to amend the Law relating to Legal Practitioners in Ireland.
45. An Act to consolidate and amend the Laws relating to Industrial and Provident Societies.
46. An Act for more effectually punishing Offences against the Laws relating to the Slave Trade.
47. An Act to make provision for the Government of the Islands of Saint Vincent, Tobago, and Grenada, and their Dependencies.
48. An Act to amend the Law with reference to Bankers' Books Evidence.
49. An Act to make provision for lighting Burghs in Scotland with Gas.
50. An Act to amend the Law for the Relief of the Poor in Ireland in respect to rating and chargeability on Poor Law Unions.
51. An Act to amend the Acts relating to Cattle Disease in Ireland.
52. An Act to amend the Law respecting the Powers and Duties vested in the Barrister appointed to certify the Rules of Savings Banks.
53. An Act to make further provision respecting the Superannuation Allowance to be granted to Civil Servants serving in unhealthy Climates.
54. An Act to provide for the Foundation of a new Bishopric out of a part of the diocese of Exeter.
55. An Act for further amending the Acts relating to the raising of Money by the Metropolitan Board of Works; and for other purposes relating thereto.
56. An Act for facilitating the regulation and improvement of Commons, and for amending the Acts relating to the Inclosure of Commons.
57. An Act to amend the Law respecting the holding of Winter Assizes.
58. An Act to amend the Law relating to Parochial Records.
59. An Act for amending the Law in respect of the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords; and for other purposes.
60. An Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament.
61. An Act to provide for the better arrangement of divided Parishes and other local areas, and to make sundry amendments in the Law relating to the Relief of the Poor in England.
62. An Act to make provision for the Disposal of certain Lands appropriated for the supply of materials for the repair of public and private roads.
63. An Act to render necessary in Ireland a Year's Notice to Quit to determine a Tenancy from Year to Year, and otherwise to amend the Law as to Notices to Quit.
64. An Act to continue for one year the Police (Expenses) Act, 1875.
65. An Act to amend the Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1860, and the Tramways (Ireland) Amendment Act, 1861, as regards the application of the same to the county and the county of the city of Dublin.
66. An Act to amend the Law relating to Legal Practitioners.
67. An Act for making provision respecting Shares in the Capital of the Universal Company of the Maritime Canal of Suez, acquired on behalf of the Crown.
68. An Act to amend the Law for the payment of Remuneration and the Grant of Superannuation Allowances and Gratuities to certain persons employed under Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the War Department and Her Majesty's Postmaster General.
69. An Act to continue various expiring Laws.

70. An Act to alter and amend the Law relating to the Administration of Justice in Civil Causes in the ordinary Sheriff Courts in Scotland, and for other purposes relating thereto.
71. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Jurisdiction of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions in Ireland.
72. An Act to suspend for a limited period the holding of an Election of a Member or Members to serve in Parliament for the City of Norwich, and to disfranchise certain voters for the said City, and also certain voters for the Borough of Boston.
73. An Act to amend the Pensions Commutation Act, 1871.
74. An Act for amending so much of the Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, 1875, as relates to the Governors of the Bounty of Queen Anne for the Augmentation of the Maintenance of the Poor Clergy.
75. An Act for making further Provision for the Prevention of the Pollution of Rivers.
76. An Act to extend the privileges of Municipal Corporations in Ireland.
77. An Act to amend the Law relating to Cruelty to Animals.
78. An Act to amend the Procedure connected with Trial by Jury in Ireland.
79. An Act to make further provision for Elementary Education.
80. An Act to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts.
81. An Act for amending the Law relating to Crossed Cheques.

The Acts contained in the following List, being Public Acts of a Local Character, are placed amongst the Local and Personal Acts.

i. An Act to render valid Marriages heretofore solemnized in the Chapel of Ease of Saint James in the parish of Buxton in the county of Derby.

ii. An Act to confirm two Provisional Orders made under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

iii. An Act to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire a site for the extension of the Manchester General Post Office.

iv. An Act to amend the Act for making regulations as to the Office of Clerk of the Peace for the County Palatine of Lancaster.

viii. An Act to confirm two Provisional Orders made under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

xiii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Arundel, the District of Bacup, the Rural Sanitary District of the Caistor Union, the City of Carlisle, the District of Milton-next-Sittingborne, the Borough of Northampton, and the District of Toxteth Park.

xiv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Local Government Board under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, with reference to the Townships of Cumberworth and Cumberworth-Half, in the West Riding of the county of York, and the borough of King's Lynn, in the county of Norfolk.

xv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Blackburn, and to the Districts of Downham Market, Melksham, Milnrow, and Saint Hellen's.

xvi. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Districts of Briton Ferry and Clayton, the Rural Sanitary District of the Coventry Union, the Borough of Nottingham (two), and the Districts of Oystermouth and Ripley.

xvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board under the provisions of the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, and the Public Health Act, 1875, relating to the District of Skelmersdale, in the county of Lancaster.

xviii. An Act for vesting Poolbeg Lighthouse in the Dublin Port and Docks Board; and for other purposes relating thereto.

xl. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Aldborough, Cattewater, Gardenstown, and Llandudno.

xli. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Brentford Gas, North Middlesex Gas, North Ormesby Gas, Retford Gas, Risca and Pontymister Gas, Saint Anne's-on-the Sea Gas, Tottenham and Edmonton Gas, Worksop Gas, Chiltern Hills Spring Water, Flamborough Water, Stockport District Water, Wisbech Water, and Clacton-on-Sea Gas and Water.

xlii. An Act for confirming a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under The Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Wantage Tramways.

xliii. An Act to facilitate the assembling and training of certain Army Corps.

xliv. An Act for remedying certain defects in the constitution of the district of All Saints, Moss, in the County and Diocese of York.

lxxxvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Boroughs of Aberavon, Andover, Brighton, and Burnley, the Districts of Merthyr Tydvil and Pensarn, the Rural Sanitary District of the Tadcaster Union, and the Borough of Truro.

xci. An Act to confirm an Order made by the Board of Trade under The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, relating to Truro.

xcii. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Chapel-en-le-Frith Gas, Cromer Gas, Hythe and Sandgate Gas, Poole Gas, Neath Water, Newbury Water, Wantage Water, Connah's Quay Gas and Water, and Flint Gas and Water.

xciii. An Act to amend the Law relating to Coroners in the County of the City of Dublin.

xciv. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made under the "Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1867," relating to the parish of Wemyss, in the county of Fife.

xcv. An Act further to amend the Acts relating to Kingstown Harbour.

xcvi. An Act to authorise the sale of Smithfield Penitentiary Convict Prison, Dublin.

xcvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the City of Bristol, the District of Burslem, the Borough of Huntingdon (two), the District of Newton-in-Mackerfield, and the Boroughs of Preston and Ryde.

xcviii. An Act to enable the Great Southern and Western Railway Company and the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company to purchase the Waterford, New Ross, and Wexford Junction Railway from the Public Works Loan Commissioners; and to raise Money for such purpose.

cl. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Bristol Tramways, Corsham Tramways, Landport, Southsea, and Portsea Tramways, Shepherd's Bush and Priory Road Acton Tramway, and Southport Tramways.

cli. An Act to preserve the Crab and Lobster Fisheries on the Coast of Norfolk.

clii. An Act to alter the Justiciary District of the County of Peebles.

cliii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Boards for Hailsham, Ilchester, Ingham, Slaugham, Swansea (United District), and Swansea Parish, Higher and Lower, to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

cliv. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for Hornsey to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

clv. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Township of Dalkey, the Galway Union, the City of Londonderry, the Newtownards United Burial Grounds District, the Omagh Waterworks, and to the Wexford Waterworks.

clvi. An Act to confirm a Scheme under the Metropolitan Commons Act, 1866, and the Metropolitan Commons Amendment Act, 1869, relating to Barnes Common.

clvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Paisley.

clviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Perth.

clix. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made under the "Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1867," relating to the burgh of Irvine and parish of Dundonald, in the county of Ayr.

clx. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for Tolleshunt Major, in the county of Essex, to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

clxi. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the borough of Carnarvon, and the Districts of Long Eaton, Saint Neots, Shepton Mallet, Tenbury Wells, Tunbridge Wells, Walton-on-the-Naze, Withington, and Whitwood.

clxii. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Waterworks in the Towns of Coleraine, Dungannon, Keady, Portrush, and Waterford.

clxiii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Lerwick.

cxcvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for Cardiff to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

cxcviii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Improvement Act District of Bingley (two), the Borough of Brighton, the Districts of Chatham and Gillingham, the Special Drainage District of Norton, the District of North Bierley, the Borough of Nottingham, the Improvement Act District of Ramsgate, the Borough of Stoke-upon-Trent (two), and the Rural Sanitary District of the Ulverstone Union.

cxcix. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Districts of Chelmsford and Merthyr Tydvil, and the Borough of Peterborough (two).

cc. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the improvement of an unhealthy area in the Whitechapel District, and an unhealthy area in the Limehouse District, within the Metropolis.

cci. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Boroughs of Bath and Birmingham, the District of Brentford, the Special Drainage District of Burgess Hill, the Rural Sanitary District of the Caistor Union, the District of Castleford, the Boroughs of Guildford, Hanley, Liverpool, Rochester, and Warwick, and the District of Worthing.

ccii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Birmingham, the Rural Sanitary District of the Chesterfield Union, the Districts of Dawlish and Keswick, the Rural Sanitary District of the Leek Union, the Borough of Maidstone, the Districts of Mistley, Moss Side, and Southend, the Rural Sanitary District of the Tadcaster Union, and the Districts of Wallasey and Weston-super-Mare.

cciii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the District of Bilbrough, the Improvement Act Districts of Bournemouth and Cirencester, the Districts of Clay Lane, Eccleshill, Felling, Nelson, and Normanton, the Improvement Act District of Runcorn, and the Districts of Stow-on-the-Wold, Sunderland, and Tormoham.

cciv. An Act to provide for the collection and distribution of certain Assets of a former Savings Bank at Tralee.

ccxxxv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Boroughs of Birmingham, Liverpool, Nottingham, and Swansea.

ccxxxvi. An Act for improvement of the Harbour of Ardglass, in the county of Down.

ccxxxvii. An Act for the improvement of the Navigation of the Lough and River Erne.

ccxxxviii. An Act to authorise the acquisition of a site in Bow Street for the erection of a new Police Court and Police Station and Offices.

ccxxxix. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for London to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

LOCAL ACTS.

The Titles to which the Letter **P.** *is prefixed are Public Acts of a Local Character.*

P. i. AN Act to render valid Marriages heretofore solemnised in the Chapel of Ease of Saint James in the parish of Buxton in the county of Derby.

P. ii. An Act to confirm two Provisional Orders made under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

P. iii. An Act to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire a site for the extension of the Manchester General Post Office.

P. iv. An Act to amend the Act for making regulations as to the Office of Clerk of the Peace for the County Palatine of Lancaster.

v. An Act to confirm the holding of certain Lands by the Derby Gaslight and Coke Company, to enable that Company to raise additional Capital, and for other purposes.

vi. An Act to authorise the Ely, Haddenham, and Sutton Railway Company to extend their authorised Railway to the Saint Ives and March Railway of the Great Eastern Railway; to change their name; and for other purposes.

vii. An Act to authorise the Scotswood, Newburn, and Wylam Railway and Dock Company to abandon the Construction of the Dock and Branch Railway near Scotswood Bridge in the county of Northumberland, to change their name; and for other purposes.

P. viii. An Act to confirm two Provisional Orders made under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

ix. An Act to authorise an Extension of Time for purchasing Land and completing the Railway authorised by the Manchester and Milford Railway (Devils Bridge Branch) Act, 1873.

x. An Act to authorise the Folkestone Gas and Coke Company to acquire further Lands; to extend their Works; to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

xi. An Act to authorise the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company to make further Arrangements for the Investment of their Reserve Fund; and for other purposes.

xii. An Act to enable the Shepton Mallet Waterworks Company to construct additional Works and to raise further Capital; and for other purposes.

P. xiii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Arundel, the District of Bacup, the Rural Sanitary District of the Caistor Union, the City of Carlisle, the District of Milton-next-Sittingborne, the Borough of Northampton, and the District of Toxteth Park.

P. xiv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Local Government Board under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, with reference to the townships of Cumberworth and Cumberworth-Half, in the West Riding of the county of York, and the borough of King's Lynn, in the county of Norfolk.

P. xv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the borough of Blackburn, and to the Districts of Downham Market, Melksham, Milnrow, and Saint Hellen's.

P. xvi. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Districts of Briton Ferry and Clayton, the Rural Sanitary District of the Coventry Union, the Borough of Nottingham (two), and the Districts of Oystermouth and Ripley.

P. xvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board under the provisions of the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, and the Public Health Act, 1875, relating to the District of Skelmersdale, in the county of Lancaster.

P. xviii. An Act for vesting Poolbeg Lighthouse in the Dublin Port and Docks Board; and for other purposes relating thereto.

xix. An Act to enlarge the Powers of the South Alloa Dock Company.

xx. An Act for the Reduction of the Nominal Capital of The Assam Company.

xxi. An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to George Tomlinson Bousfield for improvements in Lacing Devices and in the Mode of Lacing and Fastening Wearing Apparel and other Articles with the same.

xxii. An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to Charles Henry Hall for Improvements in Steam Pumps or Apparatus for Elevating Fluids by Steam.

xxiii. An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to Edward Milner for Improvements in the Method of producing White Pigments from Lead.

xxiv. An Act for empowering the British Gaslight Company, Limited, to enlarge their Works, to extend their Limits, and to expend further Capital at Kingston-upon-Hull; and for other purposes.

xxv. An Act for empowering the Local Board for the District of Padiham and Hapton, in the county of Lancaster, to acquire the Undertaking of the Padiham Gaslight and Coke Company; and for other purposes.

xxvi. An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Leicester to construct additional Works for the Prevention of Floods in the Borough; and for other purposes.

xxvii. An Act for extending the time for the completion of the Works authorised by "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands Supplemental Act (Ireland), 1868."

xxviii. An Act for extending the time limited by The Pegwell Bay Reclamation and Sandwich Haven Improvement Act, 1873, for the Purchase of Land and the Completion of Works; and for other purposes.

xxix. An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to William Cameron Sillar, Robert George Sillar, and George William Wigner, for Improvements in deodorising and purifying Sewage and making Manure therefrom.

xxx. An Act to provide for the closing of the Coombe Hill Canal Navigation, and the Sale of the Site thereof; and for other purposes.

xxxi. An Act for extending the Boundary of the Borough of Romsey, in the county of Southampton; and for other purposes.

xxxii. An Act for incorporating the Maidenhead Gas Company, and for conferring upon them powers for the supply of Gas to the borough of Maidenhead and certain neighbouring places in the counties of Berks and Buckingham; and for other purposes.

xxxiii. An Act to enable the Edinburgh and District Water Trustees to abandon their authorised Edgelaw Reservoir, and to construct the same on another Site, and also to construct a Reservoir at Rosebery, and other Works, and to make further provision for the supply of Water to their District, and otherwise; and for other purposes.

xxxiv. An Act for amending the Act (Local) of the thirteenth year of Her present Majesty, chapter five, commonly known as the Brighton Improvement (Purchase of Royal Pavilion, &c.) Act; and for other purposes.

xxxv. An Act to confer further powers on the City of Glasgow Union Railway Company, the Glasgow and South-western Railway Company, and the North British Railway Company; and for other purposes.

xxxvi. An Act to grant further powers to the Rossendale Union Gas Company.

xxxvii. An Act to amend and extend the Thames Tunnel Act, 1866, and for other purposes.

xxxviii. An Act for incorporating the Erwood Bridge Company, and for empowering them to construct a Bridge over the River Wye, with approaches thereto, in the counties of Brecon and Radnor; and for other purposes.

xxxix. An Act for improving certain Waste Lands called Flookersbrook, in the Townships of Newton and Hoole and County of Chester; and for other purposes.

P. xl. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Aldborough, Cattewater, Gardenstown, and Llandudno.

P. xli. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Brentford Gas, North Middlesex Gas, North Ormesby Gas, Retford Gas, Risca and Pontymister Gas, Saint Anne's-on-the-Sea Gas, Tottenham and Edmonton Gas, Worksop Gas, Chiltern Hills Spring Water, Flamborough Water, Stockport District Water, Wisbech Water, and Clacton-on-Sea Gas and Water.

P. xlii. An Act for confirming a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under The Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Wantage Tramways.

P. xliii. An Act to facilitate the assembling and training of certain Army Corps.

P. xliv. An Act for remedying certain defects in the constitution of the District of All Saints, Moss, in the County and Diocese of York.

xlv. An Act for varying the Purposes of the Trust constituted by Allan Glen; for incorporating the Trustees of Allan Glen's Institution in the City of Glasgow; for conferring powers upon the Trustees; and for other purposes.

xlvi. An Act for the abandonment of the Railway authorised to be made by the "Mid-Wales Railway (Western Extensions) Act, 1865."

xlvii. An Act for conferring further Powers on the Furness Railway Company, for the Construction of Works, the Acquisition of Lands, the Raising of Money, and otherwise in relation to their Undertaking; and for other purposes.

xlviii. An Act for enabling the Caledonian Railway Company to make a Wet Dock, Timber Basin, Quays, and other Works at Grangemouth, and to improve the Navigation of the River Carron; for altering the rates leviable at the Harbour of Grangemouth; for extending the period limited for the acquisition by the said Company of Lands near that Port; and for other purposes.

xlix. An Act to grant further powers to the Chesterfield Waterworks and Gaslight Company.

l. An Act for empowering the York New Waterworks Company to construct additional Works; to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

li. An Act to authorise the construction of Railways in Cumberland, to be called the Cleator and Workington Junction Railway.

lii. An Act to enable the East London Railway Company to make a New Junction with the Main Line of the Great Eastern Railway Company; and for other purposes.

liii. An Act for conferring further powers on the Glasgow and South-western Railway Company for the construction of Works and the acquisition of Lands; for converting and consolidating the several classes of their Shares and Stocks; and for other purposes.

liv. An Act to authorise the widening of parts of the London and Blackwall Railway and the enlargement of some of the Stations; to authorise agreements with other Companies; and for other purposes.

lv. An Act to vest in the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company the Undertaking of the Tunbridge Wells and Eastbourne Railway Company, and to make better provision for railway communication to Eastbourne.

lvi. An Act to make better Provision for the Maintenance of the Royal Albert Hall.

lvii. An Act for authorising the deviation of the line of a Sewer to be constructed in pursuance of the West Kent Main Sewerage Act, 1875, and for amending that Act; and for other purposes.

lviii. An Act to authorise the Whitehaven, Cleator, and Egremont Railway Company to make new Railways in the county of Cumberland; to raise further Capital; and for other purposes.

lix. An Act for incorporating the Wilts and Berks Canal Company; for the transfer to them of the Undertaking of the Wilts and Berks Canal Navigation; and for other purposes.

lx. An Act to extend the Municipal Boundaries of the Burgh of Galashiels; to provide for the maintenance by the Corporation of the Roads and Streets within the burgh, and to bring in a supply of Water thereto; and for other purposes.

lxi. An Act to define, alter, and extend the Boundaries of the Borough and Urban Sanitary District of Newport in the Isle of Wight; and for other purposes.

lxii. An Act to amend, vary, and extend the powers of the Scottish Equitable Life Assurance Society; and for other purposes relating thereto.

lxiii. An Act to incorporate a Company with Powers to erect Machinery for raising and lowering Passengers, Vehicles, Animals, and Goods between the Quayside and the Castle Yard at Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

lxiv. An Act for enabling the Caledonian Railway Company to make certain railways and other works, and to acquire certain lands, in the counties of Lanark, Stirling, Edinburgh, Renfrew, and Forfar; for abandoning certain authorised works in the county of Forfar; for extending the periods limited by certain former Acts; for sanctioning certain modifications of a scheme for the conversion and consolidation of certain classes of Shares and Stock in the said Company; and for other purposes.

lxv. An Act to amend "The Vale of Clyde Tramways Act, 1871."

lxvi. An Act to authorise the Duke of Cornwall and the Sutton Harbour Improvement Company to enter into and carry into effect Agreements for certain purposes.

lxvii. An Act for dissolving the Gorleston and Southtown Gaslight and Coke Company, Limited, for re-incorporating the Proprietors therein with others, and for conferring powers on the Company so to be incorporated; and for other purposes.

lxviii. An Act for authorising the Great Eastern Railway Company to make several Railways and other works, and for conferring on them further powers in relation to their Undertaking and the Undertakings of certain other Companies: and for other purposes.

lxix. An Act to authorise the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board to improve the river entrance to the Canada Basin; and for other purposes.

lxx. An Act for enabling the Caledonian and the Glasgow and South-western Railway Companies jointly to acquire certain lands and execute certain works in the counties of Lanark and Renfrew; for authorising the diversion of a certain road, and of certain anthorised Tramways in connexion therewith: and for other purposes.

lxxi. An Act for conferring further powers on the Company of Proprietors of the Plymouth Dock Waterworks for the supply of water and otherwise in relation to their undertaking; and for other purposes.

lxxii. An Act to enable the Yearly Conference of the People called Methodists to delegate or confer certain powers to or upon Conferences in Australasia and elsewhere, and to confirm past Acts in relation thereto; and for other purposes.

lxxiii. An Act to authorise the construction of a Railway from the Burry Port and Gwendreath Valley Railway to the Line of the Central Wales and Carmarthen Junction Railway Company; and for other purposes.

lxxiv. An Act to amalgamate the Undertakings of the Great Western and Bristol and Exeter Railway Companies; and for other purposes.

lxxv. An Act for promoting the winding up of the Western Bank of Scotland, and providing for the disposal and discharge of the remaining assets and liabilities of the Bank; and for other purposes.

lxxvi. An Act to enable the Board of Waywardens of the Edgware Highway District to make certain Payments to the Local Board of the Willesden Urban Sanitary District, out of the Income of Trust Estates and Funds vested in them under "The Metropolis (Kilburn and Harrow) Roads Act, 1872," to vary the provisions of the said Act, to discharge the said Waywardens from the obligation to maintain portions of certain Roads; and for other purposes.

lxxvii. An Act to extend the time for the completion of the Merionethshire Railway.

lxxviii. An Act for the abandonment of the Llanfyllin and Llangynog Railway.

lxxix. An Act for enabling the Metropolitan Board of Works to make a new Street from Sun Street to Worship Street; to undertake certain duties in connexion with the Chelsea Embankment; and for other purposes.

lxxx. An Act to authorise the City of Norwich Waterworks Company to raise additional Capital, and to extend their Limits of Supply; and for other purposes.

lxxxi. An Act for making a Railway from Ruthin to Carrig-y-Druidion, in the County of Denbigh.

lxxxii. An Act for making a Railway from Great Yarmouth in the county of Norfolk to Stalham in the same county; and for other purposes.

lxxxiii. An Act to extend the time for the purchase of lands for and for the construction of the Forth Bridge Railway.

lxxxiv. An Act for conferring further powers on the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company; and for other purposes.

lxxxv. An Act enabling the Dublin Port and Docks Board to enlarge or rebuild Carlisle Bridge, and to construct eastward thereof an opening bridge over the Liffey; providing funds for the execution of those works; and for other purposes.

lxxxvi. An Act for transferring to the National Assurance Company of Ireland the business of the Liberal Annuity Company of Dublin; for amending the Charter of the first-named Company; and for other purposes.

P. lxxxvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Boroughs of Aberavon, Andover, Brighton, and Burnley, the Districts of Merthyr Tydvil and Pensarn, the Rural Sanitary District of the Tadcaster Union, and the Borough of Truro.

lxxxviii. An Act for conferring further powers on the Sutton Bridge Dock Company for the Construction of Works, the raising of Money, and otherwise in relation to their Undertaking; and for other purposes.

lxxxix. An Act to enable the Local Boards for the Districts of Leigh and Hindley, both in the county of Lancaster, to construct Waterworks and to supply Water, and for transferring to them certain rights of the South Lancashire Waterworks Company; and for other purposes.

xc. An Act for dissolving and re-incorporating the Slaithwaite Gaslight Company, Limited, and granting powers for supplying with Gas the Township of Slaithwaite and certain neighbouring Townships and Places in the West Riding of the county of York.

P. xci. An Act to confirm an Order made by the Board of Trade under The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, relating to Truro.

P. xcii. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Chapel-en-le-Frith Gas, Cramer Gas, Hythe and Sandgate Gas, Poole Gas, Neath Water, Newbury Water, Wantage Water, Connah's Quay Gas and Water, and Flint Gas and Water.

P. xciii. An Act to amend the Law relating to Coroners in the County of the City of Dublin.

P. xciv. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made under the "Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1867," relating to the parish of Wemyss, in the county of Fife.

P. xcv. An Act further to amend the Acts relating to Kingstown Harbour.

P. xcvi. An Act to authorise the sale of Smithfield Penitentiary Convict Prison, Dublin.

P. xcvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the City of Bristol, the District of Burslem, the Borough of Huntingdon (two), the District of Newton-in-Mackerfield, and the Boroughs of Preston and Ryde.

P. xcviii. An Act to enable the Great Southern and Western Railway Company and the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company to purchase the Waterford, New Ross, and Wexford Junction Railway from the Public Works Loan Commissioners; and to raise Money for such purpose.

xcix. An Act for making a Railway in the County of Surrey, to be called "The Caterham and Godstone Valley Railway."

c. An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Huddersfield to abandon the enlargement of Wessenden Reservoir, and to construct a new Reservoir in lieu thereof; to make new Streets and Street Improvements; to extend the limits of Gas and Water supply; and to make further provision for the improvement and Government of the Borough; and for other purposes.

ci. An Act for incorporating the Kildwick Parish Gas Company, and authorising them to supply Gas in the Parish of Kildwick, in the West Riding of the County of York; and for other purposes.

cii. An Act for enabling the North-eastern Railway Company to make new Railways and Works, and for conferring additional powers on the Company in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other purposes.

ciii. An Act for extending the time for the completion of Works authorised to be constructed by the Paisley Waterworks Commissioners; for reviving the powers of compulsory purchase of Lands for the purposes of certain of those Works; for authorising those Commissioners to construct additional Works, to supply Water by measure, and to borrow further Money; for the prevention of waste of the Water supplied by them; and for other purposes.

civ. An Act for creating a Commission for Lighting and Buoying the Upper Mersey; for authorising that Commission to levy and receive certain Rates and Dues; and for other purposes.

cv. An Act to amend the qualification of persons entitled to vote in the Election of Trustees for the Town and Harbour of Whitehaven; to extend the periods for the compulsory purchase of Lands and for the completion of certain authorised Works; to authorise and alter certain tolls, rates, duties, and charges; to grant further powers to the trustees with reference to the Harbour, and with reference to the supply of Water; and with reference to the Town of Whitehaven, and other purposes.

cvi. An Act for better supplying with Water the parish of Uppingham, in the county of Rutland; and for other purposes.

cvii. An Act to authorise the Bristol United Gaslight Company to purchase additional Lands, and erect Works for the manufacture and storage of Gas and residual products thereon, and to construct two Bridges across Avon Street. Amendment of Acts.

cviii. An Act for making a Railway from the authorised Kelvin Valley Railway to Kilsyth, in the county of Stirling; and for other purposes.

cix. An Act for authorising the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company to make a Railway from their Railway at Chichester to their Mid-Sussex and Midhurst Junction Railway at Midhurst; and for other purposes.

cx. An Act to authorise the levy of a Rate in aid of the Letterkenny Railway; to extend the time for completing that Undertaking; and to make further provisions with reference thereto.

cxi. An Act to amend various Acts relating to Rochester Bridge, in the county of Kent, and to make further provisions for the election of Wardens and Assistants and Auditors of Rochester Bridge; and for other matters relating thereto.

cxii. An Act to authorise the Felixstowe Railway and Pier Company to construct a Tidal Basin or Dock and other works at Felixstowe in the county of Suffolk; and for other purposes.

cxiii. An Act for authorising the Southampton Dock Company to construct a Graving Dock.

cxiv. An Act to provide for the closing of the Ivel Navigation; the extinction of the Commission; and for other purposes.

cxv. An Act for vesting the Somerset and Dorset Railway in the London and South-western and Midland Railway Companies by way of Lease; and for other purposes.

cxvi. An Act to authorise the Purchase by the London and South-western Railway Company of the Exeter and Crediton Railway, and the removal of the Broad Gauge Rails on that and other Railways in North Devon; and for other purposes.

cxvii. An Act to make further provision with respect to the winding up of the affairs of the Sittingbourne and Sheerness Railway Company; the Payment of their remaining Debts, and the Distribution of any Surplus of Assets; the Dissolution of the Company; and for other purposes.

cxviii. An Act to empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Stockton-on-Tees to erect Cattle and other Markets: and for other purposes.

cxix. An Act for extending the boundaries of the Municipal Borough of Walsall, in the county of Stafford, and for transferring to the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough, the powers, duties, and property of the Commissioners acting under The Walsall Improvement and Market Act, 1848, and for authorising the Purchase by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of so much of the Gas Undertaking, late of the Birmingham and Staffordshire Gas Light Company, as relates to the supply of Gas within the Borough; and for other purposes.

cxx. An Act to authorise the construction of a Pier, Carriage Road or Promenade, Tramway, and Waterworks at or near Rosstrevor, in the county of Down.

cxxi. An Act to extend the time limited by "The Bromley Direct Railway Act, 1874," for the completion of the Railway and Works connected therewith.

cxxii. An Act for empowering the Local Board for the District of Blackrod, in the county of Lancaster, to make Waterworks, and to supply their district with Water; and for other purposes.

cxxiii. An Act for dissolving the Sutton Gas Light and Coke Company (Limited), for reincorporating the Proprietors therein with others, and for conferring powers on the Company so to be incorporated; and for other purposes.

cxxiv. An Act to provide for the Amalgamation of the Deeside and Aboyne and Braemar Railway Companies with the Great North of Scotland Railway Company; and for other purposes.

cxxv. An Act to authorise the abandonment of Railway No. 1 authorised by "The North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways Act, 1872," and to enable the North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways Company to raise further Capital; and for other purposes.

cxxvi. An Act for dissolving and re-incorporating the Redcar Gas Company, Limited, and granting powers for supplying with Gas the town of Redcar and certain neighbouring townships and places in the North Riding of the county of York; and for other purposes.

cxxvii. An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Southport to construct New Streets and other Works: to construct a New Promenade: to purchase the Undertaking of the Southport Tramways Company, Limited; to make further provisions for the Improvement of the Borough; and for other purposes.

cxxviii. An Act for incorporating and conferring Powers on the Spennymoor and Tudhoe Gas Company.

cxxix. An Act to extend and amend the Humber Conservancy Acts, 1852, 1868, and 1871, and to confer further powers on the Humber Conservancy Commissioners; and for other purposes.

cxxx. An Act for acquisition by the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council of the City of Edinburgh of the West Princes Street Gardens there, for the purpose of the same being laid open to the Public; and for the acquisition of lands at Inverleith for the formation of an Arboretum and Public Park and Pleasure Ground; and for other purposes.

cxxxi. An Act to confer further powers on the Halesowen and Bromsgrove Branch Railways Company; and for other purposes.

cxxxii. An Act for better supplying with Gas the parish or township of Horncastle, in the county of Lincoln.

cxxxiii. An Act for vesting in the London and North-western Railway Company the Undertaking of the Sirhowy Railway Company.

cxxxiv. An Act to authorise the North British Railway Company to make a Railway to connect their Edinburgh and Glasgow Line, and Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Helensburgh Branch, also a Sea Wall at Burntisland, and other Works, in the counties of Edinburgh and Lanark; to acquire additional Lands; to stop up certain Streets in Glasgow; to abandon parts of the Undertaking authorised by "The North British Railway Act, 1873;" to extend the Time for purchase of Land and completing other Railways, and for the sale of Superfluous Lands; to confirm an Agreement between the Leith Harbour and Dock Commissioners and the Company; to amalgamate with the Company the Peebles, Penicuick, and Berwickshire Railway Companies; to authorise the Company to subscribe to the Edinburgh, Loanhead, and Roslin Railway Company; to confer various Powers upon the Company with respect to their Capital and Borrowing Powers; and for other purposes.

cxxxv. An Act to authorise the North British Railway Company to make certain Railways and Works in Fifeshire, and to provide for the vesting of one of such Railways in the Forth Bridge Railway Company with working powers to the North British Railway Company; to provide for the construction of certain portions of the Forth Bridge Undertaking; to reduce the Capital and borrowing powers of the Dunfermline and Queensferry Railway Company; and for other purposes.

cxxxvi. An Act to extend the limits of supply of the Southampton Gaslight and Coke Company, and to enable them to raise additional Capital.

cxxxvii. An Act to enable the Gorsedda Junction and Portmadoc Railways Company to maintain two existing diverted portions of Railway in the Parishes of Ynyscynhaiarn and Llanfihangel y Pennant, in the county of Carnarvon, and to make a Siding in the said parish of Ynyscynhaiarn; and to raise further capital; and for other purposes.

cxxxviii. An Act for incorporating a Company and authorising them to make and maintain a Quay Wall or Embankment on the Shore of Stonehouse Pool, in the county of Devon, and other Works for the Improvement of Stonehouse Pool, and a short Line of Railway to connect the Quay and Works with the Devon and Cornwall Railway; and for other purposes.

cxxxix. An Act for extending the Boundaries of the Burgh of Burntisland for Municipal and Police Purposes; for transferring to and vesting in the Corporation the Undertaking by means of which the Burgh is at present supplied with Water; for empowering the Corporation to construct additional Waterworks, and to supply Water to the extended Burgh and places adjacent; and for other purposes.

cxl. An Act to empower the Colney Hatch Gas Company to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

cxli. An Act to incorporate a Company for making a Railway in the county of Hereford from the Great Western Railway at Pontrilas to Dorstone; and for other purposes.

cxlii. An Act for enabling the Great Southern and Western Railway Company to construct a new Road or Street at Cork; to acquire additional Lands; to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

cxliii. An Act for conferring further Powers on the Great Western Railway Company in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other purposes.

cxliv. An Act for conferring further powers on the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company.

cxlv. An Act for enabling the Midland Railway Company to construct New Railways and other Works; to acquire additional Lands; to raise further Capital; and for other purposes.

cxlvi. An Act to authorise the construction of Railways between King's Lynn and Fakenham, in the county of Norfolk; and for other purposes connected with the said Undertaking.

cxlvii. An Act to enable the Corporation of Queenborough to lay down or erect Buoys and Lights; to place Moorings; to regulate the use and navigation of West Swale; to regulate tolls, dues, and duties; to borrow money; and for other purposes.

cxlviii. An Act to enable the Local Board for the district of Tipton, in the county of Stafford, to purchase from the Corporation of Birmingham so much of the Gas Undertaking acquired by them as is situate in the parish of Tipton, and to light with Gas the said Parish; and for other purposes.

cxlix. An Act to enable the West Bromwich Improvement Commissioners to purchase from the Corporation of Birmingham so much of the Gas Undertaking acquired by them as is situate in the parish of West Bromwich, in the county of Stafford, and to light with Gas the said parish; and for other purposes.

P. cl. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Bristol Tramways, Corsham Tramways, Landport, Southsea, and Portsea Tramways, Shepherd's Bush and Priory Road Acton Tramway, and Southport Tramways.

P. cli. An Act to preserve the Crab and Lobster Fisheries on the Coast of Norfolk.

P. clii. An Act to alter the Justiciary District of the County of Peebles.

P. cliii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Boards for Hailsham, Ilchester, Ingham, Slaugham, Swansea (United District), and Swansea Parish, Higher and Lower, to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

P. cliv. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for Hornsey to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

P. clv. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Township of Dalkey, the Galway Union, the City of Londonderry, the Newtownards United Burial Grounds District, the Omagh Waterworks, and to the Wexford Waterworks.

P. clvi. An Act to confirm a Scheme under the Metropolitan Commons Act, 1866, and the Metropolitan Commons Amendment Act, 1869, relating to Barnes Common.

P. clvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Paisley.

P. clviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Perth.

P. clix. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made under the "Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1867, relating to the Burgh of Irvine and parish of Dundonald, in the county of Ayr.

P. clx. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for Tolleshunt Major, in the county of Essex, to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

P. clxi. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Carnarvon, and the Districts of Long Eaton, Saint Neots, Shepton Mallet, Tenbury Wells, Tunbridge Wells, Walton-on-the-Naze, Withington, and Whitwood.

P. clxii. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Waterworks in the Towns of Coleraine, Dungannon, Keady, Portrush, and Waterford.

P. clxiii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Lerwick.

clxiv. An Act for making a Railway from Greencastle to Kilkeel, with a Branch to Kilkeel Harbour, and a Pier at Greencastle, in the County of Down.

clxv. An Act for the Arrangement of the Affairs of the Belfast, Holywood, and Bangor Railway Company.

clxvi. An Act to authorise the Construction of a Railway from Dunton Green to Westerham, both in the County of Kent, and for other purposes connected with the said Railway.

clxvii. An Act to provide for the Local Government of the Royal and Parliamentary Burgh of Campbeltown, in the County of Argyll, for the Improvement of the Harbour thereof, and for supplying Gas and Water to the Burgh; and for other purposes.

clxviii. An Act to authorise the Charnwood Forest Railway Company to make Branch Railways near Coalville; and for other purposes.

clxix. An Act for providing an additional supply of Water to the Burgh of Dunfermline and places adjacent; and for other purposes.

clxx. An Act for conferring further powers on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company with relation to their Undertaking.

clxxi. An Act to authorise the Smethwick Local Board of Health to manufacture and supply Gas within their District; and for other purposes.

clxxii. An Act to transfer the undertaking of the Anglesey Central Railway Company to the London and North-western Railway Company; to provide for winding-up the affairs of the Anglesey Central Railway Company; and for other purposes.

clxxiii. An Act for the improvement of the Harbour of Leven, and to authorise the construction of a Wet Dock and other Works; and for other purposes.

clxxiv. An Act to amend "The Peterhead Harbours Acts, 1873;" to confer further powers upon the Trustees of the Harbours of Peterhead; and for other purposes.

clxxv. An Act for granting further powers to the Commissioners acting in execution of the Act relating to Scarborough Harbour; to alter the rates leviable under that Act; and for other purposes.

clxxvi. An Act for dissolving the Sevenoaks Gas Company, Limited, for re-incorporating the Proprietors therein with others, and for conferring on the Company so to be incorporated powers to supply Gas to the parish of Sevenoaks and certain neighbouring parishes and certain neighbouring parishes and places in the county of Kent; and for other purposes.

clxxvii. An Act to extend the time for making the Waterford and Wexford Railway; and for other purposes in relation thereto.

clxxviii. An Act to provide for the uniting the Parish of Saint Werburgh in the City of Bristol to the adjoining Parish of All Saints, and for the removing the Parish Church of Saint Werburgh and the re-erecting the same in a new Parish to be formed in the said City; and for other purposes.

clxxix. An Act for extending the Municipal and Police Boundaries of the Burgh of Kirkcaldy; for empowering the Corporation to purchase the Undertaking of the Kirkcaldy Gaslight Company, and to supply Gas; for extending the compulsory limits of Water Supply; and for other purposes.

clxxx. An Act for conferring additional powers on the London and North-western Railway Company in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other purposes.

clxxxi. An Act for authorising the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company to make new Branch Railways and other works; for conferring upon them additional powers; and for other purposes.

clxxxii. An Act to enable the Romford Canal Company to raise additional Capital.

clxxxiii. An Act to authorise the Tunbridge Wells Gas Company to acquire a new Site for the erection of Gas Works, and to confer further powers upon that Company; and for other purposes.

clxxxiv. An Act to authorise an Extension of Time to the Didcot, Newbury, and Southampton Junction Railway Company for purchasing Land and completing their Railway; and for other purposes.

clxxxv. An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Dewsbury and Heckmondwike Waterworks, and to authorise the construction of new works, and for other purposes.

clxxxvi. An Act for enabling the Corporation of the Borough of Lancaster to extend their Waterworks and to make Street Improvements; and for other purposes.

clxxxvii. An Act for incorporating the South Hants Waterworks Company; and for other purposes.

clxxxviii. An Act to confirm Agreements between the Swansea Harbour Trustees and the Corporation of Swansea, the Great Western and the Midland Railway Companies for the Leasing to that Corporation and to those Companies of Wharves and other accommodation at the Docks authorised to be constructed by the Swansea Harbour Act, 1874: and for other purposes.

clxxxix. An Act for making a Railway from Halesworth to Southwold, with Branches therefrom, all in the County of Suffolk.

cxc. An Act for dissolving the Blackrod Gas Company, Limited, for re-incorporating the Proprietors therein with others, and for conferring powers on the Company so to be incorporated to supply Gas to the township of

Blackrod and certain neighbouring townships and places in the county of Lancaster; and for other purposes.

cxci. An Act to enable the Oldbury Local Board of Health to purchase from the Corporation of Birmingham so much of the Gas Undertaking belonging to them as is situate in the District of Oldbury, in the county of Worcester, and to light with Gas the said District; and for other purposes.

cxcii. An Act to enable the Newcastle and Gateshead Water Company to construct additional Works and raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

cxciii. An Act for making Railways in the counties of Donegal, Leitrim, and Sligo, to be called the Enniskillen and Bundoran Extension and Branch Railways; and for other purposes.

cxciv. An Act to grant further powers to the Great Northern Railway Company with relation to their undertaking.

cxcv. An Act for the Amalgamation of the Cardiff and Ogmore Valley Railway Company with the Llynvi and Ogmore Railway Company; and for other purposes.

cxcvi. An Act for extending the boundaries of the borough of Stafford in the county of Stafford; and for empowering the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough to construct Waterworks; and to acquire the undertaking of the Stafford Gas Company, and to execute other improvements; and for other purposes.

P. cxcvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for Cardiff to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

P. cxcviii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Improvement Act District of Bingley (two), the Borough of Brighton, the Districts of Chatham and Gillingham, the Special Drainage District of Norton, the District of North Bierley, the Borough of Nottingham, the Improvement Act District of Ramsgate, the Borough of Stoke-upon-Trent (two), and the Rural Sanitary District of the Ulverstone Union.

P. cxcix. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Districts of Chelmsford and Merthyr Tydvil, and the Borough of Peterborough (two).

P. cc. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the improvement of an unhealthy area in the Whitechapel District, and an unhealthy area in the Limehouse District, within the Metropolis.

P. cci. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Boroughs of Bath and Birmingham, the District of Brentford, the Special Drainage District of Burgess Hill, the Rural Sanitary District of the Caistor Union, the District of Castleford, the Boroughs of Guildford, Hanley, Liverpool, Rochester, and Warwick, and the District of Worthing.

P. ccii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Birmingham, the Rural Sanitary District of the Chesterfield Union, the Districts of Dawlish and Keswick, the Rural Sanitary District of the Leek Union, the Borough of Maidstone, the Districts of Mistley, Moss Side, and Southend, the Rural Sanitary District of the Tadcaster Union, and the Districts of Wallasey and Weston-super-Mare.

P. cciii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the District of Bilbrough, the Improvement Act Districts of Bournemouth and Cirencester, the Districts of Clay Lane, Eccleshill, Felling, Nelson, and Normanton, the Improvement Act District of Runcorn, and the Districts of Stow-on-the-Wold, Sunderland, and Tormoham.

P. cciv. An Act to provide for the collection and distribution of certain Assets of a former Savings Bank at Tralee.

ccv. An Act for extending the Limits within which the Cleveland Water Company may supply Water; and for empowering them to construct additional Works and to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

ccvi. An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to Pierre Nicholas Goux for Improvements in collecting and in disinfecting Human Excreta and converting the same into Manure; also in the apparatus or means employed therein.

ccvii. An Act enabling the Belfast and County Down Railway Company to raise Preference Capital for the discharge of their Liabilities, and making other provisions with relation to the same Company and their Undertaking.

ccviii. An Act to authorise the Dudley and Oldbury Junction Railway Company to construct a New or Deviation Railway; and for other purposes.

ccix. An Act for conferring further powers on the Midland Railway Company in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies and for raising additional Capital; and for other purposes.

ccx. An Act for enabling the Sidmouth Railway Company to extend their Railway to Budleigh Salterton and Exmouth; and for other purposes.

ccxi. An Act for enabling the Shoreham Harbour Trustees to improve their Harbour by constructing new Works, and for amending the constitution of the Trust; and for other purposes.

ccxii. An Act to incorporate a Company for the construction of the Penarth Extension Railway; and for other purposes.

ccxiii. An Act to confer further powers upon the London and South-western Railway Company in respect of their Undertaking and of the Undertakings of other Companies, and to empower that Company and the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company to purchase additional Lands for the purposes of the Tooting, Merton, and Wimbledon Railway; and for other purposes.

ccxiv. An Act to incorporate the Preston Tramways Company, and to authorise the construction of Tramways in the Borough of Preston and the adjacent Township of Fulwood, both in the county of Lancaster; and for other purposes.

ccxv. An Act for extending the time for the completion of the Bodmin and Wadebridge and Delabole Railway; and for other purposes.

ccxvi. An Act for extending the time for the completion of the Cornwall Mineral and Bodmin and Wadebridge Junction Railway; and for other purposes.

ccxvii. An Act for authorising the Great Northern London Cemetery Company to dispose of their superfluous Lands; and for other purposes.

ccxviii. An Act to amend "The Prudential Assurance Company Act, 1875,"

ccxix. An Act to extend the time granted to the Severn Bridge and Forest of Dean Central Railway Company for the purchase of Lands and completion of their Railway, and to authorise them to make another short Railway; and for other purposes.

ccxx. An Act to enable the Local Board of West Ham, in the county of Essex, and the Board of Works for the District of Poplar, in the county of Middlesex, to make composition with the Owners, &c., of Stratford Langthorne Abbey for the maintenance and repair of Bridges and Roads between Bow, in the county of Middlesex, and Stratford, in the county of Essex; and for other purposes.

ccxxi. An Act to grant further Powers to the Monmouthshire Railway and Canal Company; and for other purposes with reference to the Undertaking of the Company.

ccxxii. An Act to authorize the Wakefield Waterworks Company to make a new Pumping Station and other Works, and to raise more Money; also to extend their limits of Supply; and for other purposes.

ccxxiii. An Act to further extend the time limited for the purchase of Lands for and for the completion of the Railways authorised by the Alexandra (Newport) Dock Act, 1865, and to confer further powers upon the Company; and for other purposes.

ccxxiv. An Act for authorising the East Norfolk Railway Company to construct a Branch Railway to Aylsham, in the county of Norfolk, and a Wharf on the River Bure, with a Branch Railway thereto; and for other purposes.

ccxxv. An Act for granting further powers to the Gaslight and Coke Company; and for other purposes.

ccxxvi. An Act to extend the respective periods limited by "The Metropolitan Inner Circle Completion Act, 1874," for the Compulsory Purchase of Lands for and for the Completion of the Works by that Act authorised, and to revive and extend in certain cases the Powers of the Metropolitan Inner Circle Completion Railway Company for the Purchase of Lands under that Act, and to authorise that Company to acquire additional Lands in the City of London; and for other purposes.

ccxxvii. An Act to extend the Borough of Newport, in the county of Monmouth, and to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses thereof to improve Streets, and to construct a new Street, and other Works within the same, and to make further provisions for the improvement and good government of the Borough; and for other purposes.

ccxxviii. An Act to authorise the South-eastern Railway Company to extend the Hythe and Sandgate Branch Railway to Folkestone; to widen a portion of their Charing Cross Line; to acquire additional Lands; and for other purposes.

ccxxix. An Act to grant further powers to the South Metropolitan Gaslight and Coke Company.

ccxxx. An Act for supplying with Water the Boroughs of Stockton-on-Tees and Middlesbrough, and other places adjoining or near thereto; and for other purposes.

ccxxxi. An Act to enable the Wye Valley Railway Company to construct new Railways and other Works; and for other purposes.

ccxxxii. An Act to incorporate a Company for the establishment, maintenance, and regulation of a Market on the south side of the city of Dublin, and for facilitating the approach thereto by the alteration, diversion, and widening of existing streets adjoining or near thereto; and for other purposes.

ccxxxiii. An Act to empower the North Dublin Street Tramways Company to construct new Tramways; and for other purposes.

ccxxxiv. An Act for enabling the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Halifax to construct new Works in extension of their Waterworks, and for extending their limits of Water supply, and for authorising them to extend their Gasworks; and for other purposes.

P. ccxxxv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Boroughs of Birmingham, Liverpool, Nottingham, and Swansea.

P. ccxxxvi. An Act for improvement of the Harbour of Ardglass, in the county of Down.

P. ccxxxvii. An Act for the improvement of the Navigation of the Lough and River Erne.

P. ccxxxviii. An Act to authorise the acquisition of a site in Bow Street for the erection of a new Police Court and Police Station and Offices.

P. ccxxxix. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for London to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

ccxl. An Act to authorise the East Cornwall Mineral Railway Company to extend their Railway to the South Devon and Tavistock Railway, and to Morwellham Quay on the River Tamar, and to alter the gauge and levels of their existing Railway; and for other purposes.

ccxli. An Act to amend the Llandudno Improvement Act, 1854; and for other purposes.

ccxlii. An Act for conferring further powers on the Southern Railway Company; and for other purposes.

ccxliii. An Act for making Railways in the counties of Essex and Kent to connect the London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway with the South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways; and for other purposes.

PRIVATE ACTS,

PRINTED BY THE QUEEN'S PRINTER,

AND WHEREOF THE PRINTED COPIES MAY BE GIVEN IN EVIDENCE.

1. AN Act to enable the Trustees of the Settled Estates of Sir Charles Henry Tempest, Baronet, to raise money on mortgage for the improvement thereof; and for other purposes.
2. An Act to authorise the sale of certain portions of the lands of Dochfour in the county of Inverness, being parts of the entailed estates now held by Evan Baillie of Dochfour, and to authorise the purchase of other lands to be entailed; to excamb portions of said entailed estates in the parish of Laggan for Dunain, Ness Castle, and others in the parish of Inverness; and for other purposes.

PRIVATE ACT,

NOT PRINTED.

An Act to naturalize Roger Oswald Réné de Blonay, and to grant to and confer upon him all the rights, privileges, and capacities of a natural-born subject of Her Majesty the Queen.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1876.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 9 August 1876 ;—*for*,

A RETURN "of the Number of DAYS on which THE HOUSE SAT in the Session of 1876, stating for each Day, the Date of the Month, and the Day of the Week, the Hour of Meeting, and the Hour of Adjournment ; and the Total Number of Hours occupied in the Sittings of The House, and the Average Time ; and showing the Number of Hours on which The House Sat each Day, and the Number of Hours after Midnight ; and the Number of Entries in each Day's Votes and Proceedings " (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.140, of Session 1875).

(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1876		H.	H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
Feb. 8	Tu	1½	9	15	7	45	-	-	79
,, 9	W	12	1	30	1	30	-	-	119
,, 10	Th	4	10	30	6	30	-	-	52
,, 11	F	4	7	15	3	15	-	-	207
,, 14	M	4	7	30	3	30	-	-	205
,, 15	Tu	4	8	15	4	15	-	-	72
,, 16	W	12	5	15	5	15	-	-	40
,, 17	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	45
,, 18	F	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	44
,, 21	M	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	99
,, 22	Tu	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	33
,, 23	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	74
,, 24	Th	4	2	45	10	45	2	45	55
,, 25	F	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	45
,, 28	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	83
,, 29	Tu	4	8	0	4	0	-	-	44
Total...	16	- -	-	-	107	40	9	45	1,296
Mar. 1	W	2	6	0	4	0	-	-	47
,, 2	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	60
,, 3	F	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	57
,, 6	M	4	4	15	12	15	4	15	71
,, 7	Tu	4	11	45	7	45	-	-	66
,, 8	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	44
,, 9	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	65
,, 10	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	54
,, 13	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	80
,, 14	Tu	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	69
,, 15	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	49
,, 16	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	68
,, 17	F	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	71
,, 20	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	88
,, 21	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	69
,, 22	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	50
,, 23	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	73
,, 24	F	4	8	45	4	45	-	-	60
,, 27	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	97
,, 28	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	72
,, 29	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	63
,, 30	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	89
,, 31	F	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	78
Total...	23	- -	-	-	196	5	28	15	1,540
1876		H.	H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
Apr. 3	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	107
,, 4	Tu	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	81
,, 5	W	12	5	45	5	45	-	-	53
,, 6	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	95
,, 7	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	87
,, 10	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	123
,, 11	Tu	1	2	45	1	45	-	-	22
,, 24	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	105
,, 25	Tu	4	7	45	3	45	-	-	71
,, 26	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	92
,, 27	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	86
,, 28	F	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	82
Total...	12	- -	-	-	91	40	10	30	1,004
May 1	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	92
,, 2	Tu	4	10	45	6	45	-	-	74
,, 3	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	56
,, 4	Th	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	84
,, 5	F	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	84
,, 8	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	114
,, 9	Tu	4	8	15	4	15	-	-	85
,, 10	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	78
,, 11	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	70
,, 12	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	87
,, 15	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	95
,, 16	Tu	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	89
,, 17	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	62
,, 18	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	103
,, 19	F	4	House adj. before proceeding to business for want of 40 Members.						
,, 22	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	139
,, 23	Tu	4	7	30	3	30	-	-	80
,, 24	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	79
,, 25	Th	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	76
,, 26	F	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	114
,, 29	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	122
,, 30	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	81
Total...	22	- -	-	-	169	30	19	15	1,864

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1876.

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1876		H.	H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
June 1	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	133
,, 8	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	90
,, 9	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	75
,, 12	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	106
,, 13	Tu	2	12	45	10	45	0	45	90
,, 14	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	71
,, 15	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	93
,, 16	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	81
,, 19	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	87
,, 20	Tu	2	12	15	10	15	0	15	59
,, 21	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	67
,, 22	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	81
,, 23	F	2	12	15	10	15	0	15	67
,, 26	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	92
,, 27	Tu	2	1	45	11	45	1	45	76
,, 28	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	64
,, 29	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	86
,, 30	F	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	74
Total...	18	- -	-	-	166	30	20	45	1,492
July 3	M	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	106
,, 4	Tu	2	9	5	7	5	-	-	70
,, 5	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	72
,, 6	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	99
,, 7	F	2	10	15	8	15	-	-	73
,, 10	M	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	109
,, 11	Tu	2	1	15	11	45	1	15	69
,, 12	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	55
,, 13	Th	4	2	45	10	45	2	45	91
,, 14	F	2	9	5	7	5	-	-	56
cont.		H.	H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
July 17	M	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	92
,, 18	Tu	2	9	5	7	5	-	-	75
,, 19	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	52
,, 20	Th	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	78
,, 21	F	2	1	30	11	30	1	30	74
,, 24	M	4	2	45	10	45	2	45	95
,, 25	Tu	2	9	5	7	5	-	-	36
,, 26	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	43
,, 27	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	62
,, 28	F	2	2	30	12	30	2	30	58
,, 29	Sa	12	2	30	2	30	-	-	15
,, 31	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	64
Total...	22	- -	-	-	191	35	26	15	1,554
Aug. 1	Tu	2	2	0	12	0	2	0	59
,, 2	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	32
,, 3	Th	4	4	30	12	30	4	30	68
,, 4	F	2	1	15	11	15	1	15	58
,, 5	S	12	9	0	9	0	-	-	34
,, 7	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	92
,, 8	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	73
,, 9	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	43
,, 10	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	72
,, 11	F	3	3	0	12	0	3	0	62
,, 12	S	12	7	0	7	0	-	-	34
,, 14	M	$2\frac{1}{2}$	6	10	3	40	-	-	55
,, 15	Tu	$1\frac{1}{2}$	Prorogation.						
Total...	13	- -	-	-	109	15	16	45	682

SUMMARY.

Month.	Days of Sitting.	Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1876		H.	M.	H.	M.	
February......	16	107	40	9	45	1,296
March.........	23	196	5	28	15	1,540
April	12	91	40	10	30	1,004
May	22	169	30	19	15	1,864
June...........	18	166	30	20	45	1,492
July	22	191	35	26	15	1,554
August.........	13	109	15	16	45	715
Total......	126	1,032	15	131	30	9,465

Average Time of Sitting, 8 Hours 11 $\frac{1}{20}$ Minutes.

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1876—(PARL. PAPER 0.148.)

SUMMARY.

Number of Divisions on Public Business before Midnight	...	...	122
Ditto ,, ,, after Midnight	...	...	117
Ditto—Private Business ,, before Midnight	...	...	3
Ditto ,, ,, after Midnight	...	...	—
Total Number of Divisions in Session 1876	...	...	242

GENERAL INDEX TO SESSION 1876.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

being a principal object of this Index, that the proceedings on each tion shall be completely recorded, some abbreviations of forms were essary. Those who are accustomed to the proceedings of Parliament l readily fill up the voids. Those who are not so familiar, may find the lowing explanation useful, but will find the whole *formulæ* set out at gth in the "Contents."

The names which immediately follow the title of a Bill are those of the ers or hon. Members who have charge of the Bill.

The numbers which are added at stages of Bills are the official numbers the prints and reprints ordered at each stage, and, with the Statute, will able the reader to follow all the changes the Bill has undergone.

The entries—Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a;" Amendt. his day six months;" Question put, "That 'now,' &c."—indicate the ual form of raising the issue—namely, "That the word 'now' stand rt of the Question."

"*The Ballot,* Amendt. on Committee of Supply' indicates that e Question was raised by means of an Amendment moved on the otion (after the Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee Supply had been read), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." this case the issue is formally raised by the Motion "To leave out from e word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add" other words. ne decision is taken on the Question, "That the words proposed to be ftout stand part of the Question."

The Nos. added to the "Parliamentary Papers" are in most cases those ven in the Commons' "List of Papers for Sale."

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE THIRD SESSION OF THE

TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

39° & 40° VICTORIA.

1876.

Explanation of the Abbreviations.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1ª, 2ª, 3ª, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY — NAVY — INDIA — IRELAND — SCOTLAND — PARLIAMENT — POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS — CHURCH OF ENGLAND — EDUCATION — CRIMINAL LAW — LAW AND JUSTICE — TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

ABERDARE, Lord
- Bankers Books Evidence, 2R. [230] 1470
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 30, [230] 1432; Report, *cl.* 30, Amendt. 1518
- Education—Schools, [231] 513
- Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 806
- Intemperance, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 733
- Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Comm. [230] 1520
- Poor Law Amendment, 2R. [230] 1277
- Prevention of Crimes Act Amendment, 2R. [230] 485
- Sulphurous Acid, &c., Address for a Royal Commission, [228] 606, 609
- Trade Union Act (1871) Amendment, 2R. [229] 1259

ABERDEEN, Earl of
- Intemperance, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 723
- Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 6
- Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 13, [230] 104
- Railway Accidents, Royal Commission on—Brakes, [229] 1097

ACLAND, Sir T. D., *Devonshire, N.*
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [229] 1529, 1530 *cl.* 12, 1533; *add. cl.* 1570
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1409; *add. cl.* 1996

Adam, Right Hon. W. P., *Clackmannan, &c.*
- Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1651
- Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, Res. [229] 1578
- Metropolis — Hyde Park — The Serpentine, [228] 969 ; Res. 1248
- Supply—Home and Colonial Offices, New, [229] 1587
  - Metropolitan Police Courts, [229] 1591
  - National Gallery Enlargement, [229] 1588
  - Natural History Museum, [229] 1590
  - Royal Parks and Gardens, [229] 1583, 1584

Adderley, Right Hon. Sir C. B. (President of the Board of Trade), *Staffordshire, N.*
- Coal—Sale by Weight, [227] 816
- Copyright Commission, [228] 64
- Customs—Solicitor, Office of the, [231] 701
- Dover Harbour, [227] 136
- Dover Pier—English and Foreign Mail Boats, [230] 1886
- English Channel—Straits Tunnel, The, [230] 947
- Foreshores—Balbriggan Foreshore, [230] 1045
- Gas Companies Act—Gas Referees, [229] 1111
- Gas, Price of, [231] 969
- Harbours of Refuge—Dungeness, [227] 553
- Harbours of Refuge—North-East Coast, Res. [231] 37
- Holyhead Harbour — Steamship "Edith," Wreck of, [229] 670
- Mercantile Marine—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Life Saving Apparatus, [231] 120
  - "Royal Adelaide," Wreck of the, [227] 1869
  - "Strathmore," The, [230] 243
  - Training Ship Schools, [227] 816
  - Unseaworthy Ships, [227] 407, 680
  - Wrecks off Dungeness, [229] 1356
- Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1832
- Merchant Service Officers, Res. [229] 802

227] Merchant Shipping, Leave, 163 ; 2R. 460
228] Comm. 532, 539, 543 ; *cl.* 3, 551, 638, 639,
. 643, 681, 686, 887, 899, 901, 907 ; *cl.* 4,
. 909, 910, 911 ; *cl.* 5, 1149, 1156, 1157,
. 1158, 1159 ; *cl.* 6, 1160, 1367 ; *cl.* 9,
. 1368 ; *cl.* 10, 1370 ; Amendt. 1371 ; *cl.* 11,
. *ib.* ; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1372 ; *cl.* 13, 1373,
. 1374 ; *cl.* 14, *ib.*, 1375, 1582, 1585, 1586,
. 1587, 1590 ; *cl.* 15, 1593, 1597, 1599,
. 1601, 1613, 1614, 1615, 1616, 1617, 1618 ;
. *cl.* 16, 1788, 1800, 1802 ; *cl.* 17, 1804 ; *cl.* 18,
. 1805, 1806, 1807 ; *cl.* 19, 1880, 1881, 1882 ;
. *cl.* 21, 1884 ; *cl.* 23, *ib.* ; *cl.* 24, 1885, 1913,
. 1914 ; *cl.* 26, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 27, 1915,
. 1916, 1917 ; *cl.* 28, 1918, 1919 ; *cl.* 32,
. Amendt. 1920 ; Postponed *cl.* 16, *ib.* ; *add.*
. *cl.* 1920, 1921 ; Amendt. 1937, 1938, 1940,
. 1943
229] 54, 56, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69,
. 70, 74, 95, 208, 212, 217, 218, 219, 222,
. 228, 231, 234, 235 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1054,
. 1055, 1056, 1057, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1063 ;
. *cl.* 4, 1066 ; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1067 ; *cl.* 11,
. 1068 ; Amendt. 1069, 1070, 1071 ; *cl.* 18,
. 1072, 1073, 1075 ; *cl.* 19, 1076 ; *cl.* 20, 1077 ;
. Amendt. *ib.*, 1078 ; Amendt. 1079 ; *cl.* 22,

[*cont.*

Adderley, Right Hon. Sir C. B.—*cont.*
229] 1080 ; *cl.* 24, Amendt. 1081, 1274 ; 3R. 1334
231] Lords Amendts. 1170, 1177 ; Amendt. 1180 ;
. Amendt. 1181, 1184 ; Lords consequential
. Amendt. 1222
- Merchant Shipping—Lighthouse on Coningbeg Rock, [229] 1352
- Merchant Shipping Acts—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Board of Trade Surveys—"Mount Royal," [227] 1566
  - Grain Cargoes, [229] 1519
  - Grain Laden Vessels, [227] 1024
  - Light Dues, [231] 421
  - Load Line Returns, [227] 1708
  - Merchant Seamen Deserters, [230] 423
  - Merchant Shipping Act, 1854—Surgeons, [229] 105
  - Merchant Shipping Act, 1871—"Leader," The Schooner, [230] 856
  - Merchant Shipping Acts 1875 and 1876—Surveyors, [230] 947
  - Overloading, [227] 1123
  - "Royal Sovereign," Scurvy on Board the, [227] 302
  - Rule of the Road at Sea, [227] 404
  - Scurvy, Cases of, [227] 1414, 1716
  - Ships' Surgeons, [230] 1963
  - "Skerryvore," The, [230] 245
  - Steamer "Marie," [230] 1630
  - Stowage, [228] 1478
  - "Strathclyde," The, [227] 1024
  - "Strathclyde" Collision — Tug "Palmerston," [230] 336
  - Unseaworthy Ships, [228] 472
  - Unseaworthy Ships of Foreign Nations, [227] 1419
- Midland Railway—Radstock Accident—Block System, [231] 1078
- Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1603
- Oyster Fishery—Herne Bay, [228] 266 ; [231] 8
- Ports, Harbours, &c., United Kingdom, [231] 699
- Railway Accident, Great Western, [231] 8, 517
- Railway Accidents, Commission on—Report, [227] 301, 928
- Railway Companies—Dismissal of Servants, [230] 336
- Seal Fisheries Act, 1875—Close Time, [230] 1480
  - International Agreement, [227] 263

Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 6 [Bill 121]
Read 2°, after short debate *April* 28, [228] 1885
Committee * ; Report *May* 16
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *May* 18
Considered * *May* 22
Read 3° * *May* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 22 (No. 95)
Committee * *June* 26 (No. 145)
Report * *June* 27
Read 3ª * *June* 29
c. Order read, for taking into Consideration the Lords Amendts. *July* 10, [230] 1272 ; Moved, "That the Lords Amendts. be now con-

[*cont.*

Admiralty Jurisdiction (*Ireland*) *Bill*—cont.

sidered;" after short debate, Question put; A. 139, N. 58; M. 81; Lords Amendts. considered; First Amendt. read

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendt.;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Biggar*); Motion withdrawn

Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*); Motion withdrawn

Original Question put, and agreed to; subsequent Amendts. agreed to [Special Entry]

l. Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 28]

Advocate, The Lord (Right Hon. E. S. **Gordon**), *Glasgow, &c. Universities*

Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1127

Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 218

Burghs (Division into Wards) (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [229] 1339

Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 40

Dunkeld Bridge Trust, [231] 696

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland), Leave, [227] 2076

Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1386

Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 30, Amendt. [228] 1919, 1920

Poor Law (Scotland), Leave, [228] 1554; 2R. [229] 258; Comm. [230] 529; [231] 1204

Prisons (Scotland), Leave, [230] 1421

Publicans Certificates (Scotland), 2R. [227] 331

Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Leave, [228] 914

Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions

- Agricultural Holdings, [227] 1020
- Criminal Law—"Amelia," The, Case of, [227] 1713
- Endowed Schools and Hospitals, [227] 399
- Intestates Act, [227] 818
- Poor Inspectors — Superannuation, [228] 1180
- Poor Law Expenditure, [227] 817
- Private Lunatic Asylums, [230] 1134
- Sasine Office (Edinburgh), [227] 681
- Session, Court of—Returns as to the, [227] 1419
- Sheriff Courts, [227] 264; [230] 1623

Sheriff Courts (Scotland), 2R. [231] 561

Africa

West Coast

Cession of the Gambia, Question, Observations, Lord Cottesloe; Reply, The Earl of Carnarvon *Mar* 20, [228] 264; Question, Mr. Edward Jenkins; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther, 272; — *Exchange of Territory*, Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; An-
227] swer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 10, 133; Observations, The Earl of Carnarvon; debate thereon *Feb* 17, 374; Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Feb* 21, 561; Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 22, 683; Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 9, 1710;— *The Acting Administrator of the Gambia*, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 31,
231] 118

[*cont.*

Africa—West Coast—cont.

Dahomey — The Threatened Bombardment, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 15, [229] 671;—*The King of Dahomey*, Question, Observations, Lord Cottesloe; Reply, The Earl of Carnarvon; short debate thereon *May* 16, 764;—*Disputes with Dahomey*, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 31, [231] 119

Native Labourers — African Mail Steamers, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer Mr. J. Lowther *August* 7, [231] 690

Sierra Leone—Financial Position, Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 22, [229] 1039

The Gold Coast—Case of Messrs. Swanzy, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 10, [231] 969; —*Whydah, The Outrage at*, Question, Observations, Lord Cottesloe; Reply, The Earl of Carnarvon *Mar* 24, [228] 555

Papers relating to Gold Coast .	[1402]
Affairs of the Gambia .	[1409] [1409-I]
Petition of Inhabitants of Gambia	[1498]

Africa—River Gambia

Moved, "That it is expedient that the British possessions on the Gambia be placed on a satisfactory footing, and that, in the interests of commerce, communication be opened up by that river with the interior of Africa" (*Mr. Alderman M'Arthur*) *May* 2, [228] 1998; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Agnew, Mr. R. Vans, *Wigton Co.*

Scotland—Hypothec, Law of, [227] 135

Agricultural Children Act

Question, Observations, The Duke of St. Albans; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short debate thereon *Feb* 10, [227] 130;—*Case of Henry Cole*, Question, Mr. Rodwell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 4, [229] 46

Agricultural Holdings (*England*) *Act*

Greenwich Hospital Estates, Question, Mr. Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 16, [228] 65

Stamps, Question, Sir John Kennaway; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 16, [228] 63

Agricultural Holdings (*England*) *Act* (1875)

Moved that there be laid before this House, Return of Landowners of 500 acres and upwards in each county in England and Wales, showing those who have contracted themselves out of the provisions of the Agricultural Holdings Act up to 1st June 1876 (*The Earl De La Warr*) *May* 26, [229] 1260; after short debate, Motion negatived

Agricultural Holdings (England) Act (1875)
Moved for, Return of the Public Departments which hold land as Owners or Occupiers in England and Wales, specifying whether they have or have not contracted themselves out of the provisions of the Agricultural Holdings Act up to the 1st of June, 1876 (*The Earl of Camperdown*) *May* 29, [229] 1342
After short debate, Return of all the Reports made to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners by their surveyors relative to the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875: Ordered to be laid before the House (*The Lord President*) (No. 97)

Agricultural Holdings (England) Act (1875)
Moved, "That there be laid before this House —a Return showing whether the provisions of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, have or have not been adopted upon the estates held by the Duchy of Cornwall, the Charity Commissioners, and the Commissioners of Greenwich Hospital" (*The Earl of Camperdown*) *June* 19, [230] 1; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to

Agricultural Holdings (England) Act (1875)—*The Duchy of Lancaster*
Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Colonel Taylor *Mar* 10, [227] 1796
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 26, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is undesirable that the benefits intended by Parliament to accrue to any class of Her Majesty's subjects from the passing of any statute should be neutralized by the official action of a Member of the Administration responsible for the enactment of that statute" (*Dr. Cameron*) *v.*, [229] 1276; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 226, N. 53; M. 173

Agricultural Holdings (England) Act (1875) Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*Changed from*—
"Queen Anne's Bounty Bill") [H.L.]
(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 23 (No. 141)
Read 2ª* *July* 21
Committee*; Report *July* 24
Read 3ª* *July* 25
c. Read 1º* *July* 31 [Bill 278]
Read 2º* *August* 4
Committee*; Report *August* 7
Considered* *August* 8
Read 3º* *August* 10
l. Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 74]

Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
228] *l.* Presented; read 1ª, after short debate, *Mar* 28, 691 (No. 44)
. Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 7, 1379
229] Committee; Report, after short debate *May* 8, 184

[*cont.*

Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill—cont.
229] Read 3ª *May* 11, 350
c. Read 1º* (*The Lord Advocate*) *May* 22
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *June* 8; debate adjourned
230] Debate resumed *July* 6, 1126
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Ramsay*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2º [Bill 159]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 20

Airlie, Earl of
Burgesses (Scotland), 2R. [228] 466
Court of Session (Scotland)—Returns, [228] 1625
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [229] 1032; Comm. *cl.* 5, [230] 124
Gas Light and Coke Company, 2R. [230] 231
University of Oxford, 2R. [227] 1694; [228] 348; Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. 954; Amendt. 1304, 1307; 3R. [229] 102

Alexander, Colonel C., *Ayrshire, S.*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia Staff Pensioners, [230] 1172
Army Estimates—Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers and Half Pay, [229] 1658
Works, Buildings, &c., [229] 1651
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 207
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 106, [228] 912
Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 259
Post Office — Postal Telegraph Department, Res. [228] 198
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [228] 1810, 1811, 1813

Aliens' Order in Council, 1873—*Gibraltar*
Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 28, [228] 1831

Allen, Mr. W. S., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1346

All Saints, Moss, Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Archbishop of York*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 2 (No. 70)
Read 2ª* *May* 8
Committee*; Report *May* 9
Read 3ª* *May* 11
c. Read 1º* *May* 26 [Bill 172]
Read 2º* *June* 8
Committee*; Report *June* 15
Read 3º* *June* 16
l. Royal Assent *June* 27 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 44]

Ancient Monuments Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Osborne Morgan*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 9 [Bill 21]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 12

ANDERSON, Mr. G., *Glasgow*
- Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1127
- Army—Home District Command, [227] 1870
- Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 957
- Army and Navy Expenditure, 1874-5, Comm. [231] 660
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1278, 1456
  - War Office, [229] 1658
- Banks of Issue—Re-Appointment of Committee, [227] 555
  - The Committee, [228] 352
- Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 213
- Brazil—Outrage on a British Subject, [227] 403
- Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 23
- Consolidated Fund, 3R. [228] 565
- Criminal Law—James Timony, Case of, [230] 853
  - Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1044, 1048
- Dunkeld Bridge Trust, [231] 696
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1720
- Erne Lough and River, Comm. [230] 1764
- Factory Legislation (India), [227] 301
- France and the United States—Reported Commercial Treaty, [231] 116
- Henwood, Mr. Charles, Petition of, Res. [227] 1405
- House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 553
- Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [228] 1196
- Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1374
- Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 298
- Malta—Civilian Government, [229] 1666
- Malta—Taxation in, Res. [229] 1979, 1987
- Mercantile Marine—Nautical Terms, Uniformity of, [227] 557
- Merchant Shipping Acts—Overloading, [227] 1123
- Metropolis Improvements — Northumberland Avenue, [229] 205
- Monastic and Conventual Institutions, Petition, [229] 846
- Municipal Officers Superannuation (No. 2), 2R. [227] 326
- Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  - "Alberta" and "Mistletoe," Collision of, [227] 258, 1204;—Report of Court of Inquiry, [228] 1410;—Coroner's Jury, 1761;—Captain Welsh, [229] 1194;—Further Inquiries, [230] 428
  - H.M.S. "Raleigh," [230] 257
  - H.M.S. "Thunderer," [230] 1888, 1971
  - Navigating Officers, [227] 682
- Navy—"Alberta" and "Mistletoe" Collision, Res. [228] 1486
- Navy—Captain Sulivan, Res. [230] 1332, 1397
- Navy Estimates—Miscellaneous Services, [230] 474
  - Scientific Departments, [229] 2021; [230] 461
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Order—Balloting for Motions, [230] 11, 15
  - Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1640;—Easter Recess, [228] 1100

[*cont.*

ANDERSON, Mr. G.—*cont.*
- Parliament — Private Bill Committees—Referees—Instruction, Res. [228] 618
- Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 485, 499;—Nomination of Select Committee, 1495, 1497
- Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 329
- Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 427; Res. [231] 754
- Pollution of Rivers, 3R. [231] 357
- Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 259; Comm. [230] 527
- Post Office—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Glasgow Post Office, [228] 1832
  - Postal Telegraph Service — Royal Engineers, [227] 1710
  - Postal Telegraph Wires, [228] 1579
  - Telegraph Stamps, [227] 404
- Prisons Bill—Prison Chaplains, [230] 737
- Queen's Visit to Germany, [228] 700, 701, 882, 883
- Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 423; 2R. 1753; Comm. [228] 136; 3R. 482; Proclamation, 1764, 1766
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1345
- Sheriff Courts (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [231] 562, 564
- Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 510, 514
  - Exchequer and other Offices in Scotland [227] 990
  - Fishery Board in Scotland, [227] 993
  - Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, [227] 1840
  - Mint, including Coinage, [227] 522, 523
- Turkey—Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [230] 1184; [231] 721
- United States—General Schenck, [227] 1798
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1141

Animals, Cruelty to—Action of the Society
- Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 3, [227] 1295

ANSTRUTHER, Sir R., *Fifeshire*
- Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1357, 1364
- Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 36
- Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1648, 1649
- Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [228] 1206
- Poor Inspectors (Scotland)—Superannuation, [228] 1180
- Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1441
- Slave Trade (East Africa), Res. [228] 1219
- Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1724

ANSTRUTHER, Sir W. C., *Lanarkshire, S.*
- Burghs and Populous Places (Scotland) Gas Supply, 2R. [228] 3; Comm. [229] 998

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1^{a}* *Feb* 11 (No. 5)
227] Read 2^{a}, after debate *Feb* 25, 909
. Committee, after short debate *Mar* 3, 1286
Report * *Mar* 10
. Read 3^{a} *Mar* 14, 1946 (No. 23)
228] *c.* Read 1° * (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 21 [Bill 111]
229] Read 2°, after short debate *June* 12, 1680
230] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 4, 982
After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Forsyth*); Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
. Adjourned Debate resumed *July* 7, 1144; after debate, Question put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.
231] Committee—R.P. *August* 7, 759
. Committee; Report *August* 8, 858
. Considered; Read 3°, after short debate *August* 9, 879
. *l.* Commons Amendts. considered, and agreed to, after debate *August* 10, 946
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 59]

ARCHDALL, Mr. W. H., *Fermanagh*
Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 991

Arctic Expedition—See title *Navy—Miscellaneous Questions*

Ardglass Harbour Improvement Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 19 [Bill 200]
Read 2° *, and referred to the Committee on Arklow Harbour Improvement Bill *July* 11
Report of Select Committee *July* 20
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report, after short debate *July* 21, [230] 1762
Read 3° * *July* 26
l. Read 1^{a}* (*Lord Elphinstone*) *July* 27 (No. 193)
Read 2^{a} *August* 7, [231] 688
Report * *August* 8
Committee *; Report *August* 9
Read 3^{a}* *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxxvi]

Ardglass Harbour [*Expenses of Works*]
c. Considered in Committee *July* 13, [230] 1426; a Resolution agreed to

ARGYLL, Duke of
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 1R. [228] 695; 2R. 1379; Comm. *cl.* 23, [229] 184; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 186
Church of Scotland (Election of Ministers), Motion for Returns, [228] 1385
Council of India—Indian Tariff, [228] 922, 924, 1379; [227] 1976, 1988, 1994, 1998
[*cont.*

ARGYLL, Duke of—*cont.*
Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [228] 167, 169; Comm. 346
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 117, 119; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 124
Irish Peerage, Report, [229] 191
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), 2R. [229] 483, 486; Comm. *cl.* 13, [230] 102
Turkey—Insurrectionary Provinces, [230] 385

Arklow Harbour Improvement Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 19 [Bill 199]
Read 2° *, and referred to a Select Committee *July* 11
Ordered, "That the Select Committee do consist of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two to be nominated by the Committee of Selection; Mr. Basil Woodd (Chairman), Mr. Assheton, and Mr. O'Shaughnessy accordingly nominated Members of the Committee; Mr. Dundas, Mr. Egerton Hubbard nominated by the Committee of Selection
Ordered, That the Ardglass Harbour Bill and the Erne Lough and River Bill be referred to the Committee
Ordered, That the Select Committee do consist of Seven Members *July* 17, [230] 1517; Sir George Balfour and Colonel Makins added to the Committee (*Mr. William Henry Smith*)
Bill withdrawn * *July* 20

Arklow Harbour Improvement [*Expenses of Works*]
c. Considered in Committee *July* 13, [230] 1425; a Resolution agreed to

ARMY

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Army and Auxiliary Forces—Returns, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 27, [228] 1760
Army and Navy Surgeons—Foreign Diplomas, Question, Dr. Brady; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 16, [229] 777
Army Chaplains — Compensation, Question, Colonel Makins; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 12, [229] 1664
Army Estimates—The Increased Pay of the Soldiers, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 3, [227] 1295

Army Medical Department
Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 11, [231] 1076;—*Examinations*, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 14, [227] 257
Civilian Doctors, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 17, [227] 401
[*cont.*

ARMY—*Army Medical Department*—cont.

Medical Officers—Exchanges, Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 23, [228] 476;—*The Regulations*, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 10, [227] 1799;—*Warrant of* 1876, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 26, [230] 426

Medical School—The Professorships, Question, Mr. O'Leary; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 30, [228] 882

Senior Surgeons Major, Question, Mr. O'Leary; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 6, [230] 1048

Veterinary Surgeons, Questions, Mr. Stacpoole; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 27, [228] 619; *April* 28, 1830;—*The Principal*, Questions, Mr. Stacpoole; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 13, [227] 1864; *July* 17, [230] 1474

Army Medical Reports, Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 1, [231] 254

Army (Metropolis)—Sentries, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 9, [227] 1715

Military Etiquette, Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 12, [231] 1158

Army Mobilization

Question, Observations, Lord Waveney; Reply, Earl Cadogan; short debate thereon *August* 1, [231] 226

Localization of the Forces, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 12, [229] 1667

Mobilization of Army Corps, Question, General Shute; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 21, [227] 556; Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 16, [228] 69;—*The Volunteers*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 31, 968

Mobilization of the Forces, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 22, [230] 260; Observations, Captain Nolan; Replies, Mr. Stanley, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; debate thereon *June* 23, 366;—*The Army Estimates*, Question, General Shute; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 30, [229] 1418; Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, 1420;—*The Reserve*, Questions, Sir Henry Havelock; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 29, [230] 618

The Longford Rifle Militia, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 7, [231] 691

The Monaghan Militia, Question, Mr. Owen Lewis; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 27, [230] 1969

The Second Army Corps—The Irish Militia, Question, Mr. J. C. Brown; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 21, [230] 1698

The Wexford Militia, Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 24, [230] 1817

Army Recruiting, Observations, Sir George Campbell; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate thereon *June* 9, [229] 1630;—

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

The Recruiting Regulations, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 2, [227] 1206

Artillery, Royal—Lieutenant Colonels, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 3, [228] 1098;—*Non-commissioned Officers*, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 9, [229] 1603

Artillery and Engineers—Promotion, Question, Major Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 18, [227] 482

Audit of Army and Navy Expenditure Accounts, Observations, Mr. J. Holms; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *June* 16, [229] 2001

Barracks

Accommodation for Soldiers in Barracks, Observations, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Reply, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 9, [227] 1766

Barracks at Aldershot, Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 17, [227] 405

Barracks at Omagh, Question, Mr. Henry Corry; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 14, [227] 259

Model Cavalry Barrack, Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 9, [227] 1717

227] *Knightsbridge Barracks*, Question, Mr. J.
R. Yorke; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy
Feb 21, 555; Question, Observations, Lord
Sandhurst; Reply, Earl Cadogan *Feb* 29,
1110; Observations, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate
thereon *Mar* 2, 1221; Question, Mr. J. R.
Yorke; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 3,
1294;—"*Preservation of Peace*" *in London*, Question, Mr. Herbert; Answer, Mr.
228] Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 16, 64;—*The Model*,
Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, Mr. Ga-
229] thorne Hardy *May* 4, 50; Question, Viscount
Powerscourt; Answer, Earl Cadogan; short
debate thereon *May* 18, 915

[See title *Army—Knightsbridge Barracks*]

Portsmouth Forts, Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 28, [227] 1021

Winchester Barracks, Question, Mr. Simonds; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 22, [230] 249

Captain Roberts, 94th Regiment—The Court Martial, Questions, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 16, [229] 1970; *June* 19, [230] 9; Questions, Mr. Stacpoole; Answers, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck *July* 27, 1961; *August* 3, [231] 414; Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, 418

Case of Lieutenant Walker, Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 10, [231] 971

Cavalry, Supernumerary Majors of, Question, Mr. Tennant; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 16, [228] 74

Church Attendance of Soldiers—Payment for Sittings, Question, Observations, The Earl of Belmore; Reply, Earl Cadogan *Mar* 10, [227] 1793

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Commissariat and Transport Officers, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 16, [228] 66

Commissions, Sale of—The Royal Warrant of 1870, Question, Colonel Egerton Leigh; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 28, [227] 1023

Connaught Rangers, The, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 14, [227] 261

Depôt Battalions, Lieutenant Colonels of, Question, Colonel Kingscote; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 28, [228] 1836

Desertion—Case of Samuel Chappel, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 29, [229] 1347

Drill and Exercise in Hot Weather, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 18, [230] 1526

Dublin Garrison—Typhoid Fever, Question, Mr. Clive; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 14, [227] 2015

Forage Allowance to Mounted Officers, Question, Colonel Kingscote; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 28, [228] 1835; Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 29, [229] 1353; Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 20, [230] 1621

Grocery Rations, Issue of, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 27, [228] 626

Guards, The—Special Allowances, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 31, [228] 968; Observations, Mr. A. Moore; Reply, Mr. Stanley; short debate thereon *June* 16, [229] 1989;—*Stock-Purse Fund Allowance*, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *April* 25, [228] 1626; Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 27, 1762
Return—(*Parl. P.* 168)

Home District Command, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 13, [227] 1870

India—Roman Catholic Chaplains, Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *July* 11, [230] 1280; *July* 13, 1396

Indian and Home Services, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 17, [227] 397

Insubordination at Aldershot — St. Patrick's Day, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 23, [228] 470

King George of Hanover, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 22, [230] 256

Line and Scientific Corps—The Garrison of Belfast, Question, Major Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 27, [230] 1970

Malta—Fortifications of, Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr; Reply, Earl Cadogan *June* 27, [230] 487

Martini-Henry Rifle, The, Question, Observations, The Duke of St. Albans; Reply, Earl Cadogan; short debate thereon *Feb* 22, [227] 666

Military Prisoners—Case of Gunner Charlton, Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 14, [227] 256; Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 27, [230] 1962; Questions, Sir Edward Watkin; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 9, [231] 874;—*Handcuffs*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 3, [231] 422

Military Scandal at Hythe, Question, Mr. Sandford; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 14, [227] 259; Observations, Mr. Sandford *Mar* 2, 1219

Patented Inventions—Small Arms, Question, Sir Walter Barttelot; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *July* 17, [230] 1479

Payment of Pensions, Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 24, [230] 1810

Pay of Soldiers and Marines, Observations, Sir Henry Havelock; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate thereon *Mar* 9, [227] 1771

Promotion and Retirement—The Commission, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 14, [227] 260; Questions, Captain Nolan, Sir Henry Havelock; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 10, [231] 972

Purchase and Exchange, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 7, [231] 699

Recruiting, Question, Mr. Wilson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 10, [227] 1795
[See title *Army Recruiting*]

Regimental Exchanges, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 10, [230] 1178

Retired Officers, Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 22, [230] 245

Return of Arrears of Pay, Question, Colonel Jervis; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 7, [231] 698

Sea-Ports Defences — The Firth of Forth, Question, Mr. Cowan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 7, [227] 1565

The Army List—Her Majesty the Queen, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 20, [230] 1626

The Grenadier Guards—Death of Colour-Sergeant Brown, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 26, [230] 421

The Moncrieff Gun Carriage, Question, Mr. Maitland; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *August* 3, [231] 418

The Moncrieff System of Artillery, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *June* 26, [230] 419

The National Rifle Association—Martini-Henry Rifles, Question, General Shute; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 24, [228] 561

The Pension Warrant—Increase of Pay, Question, Mr. Pateshall; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 22, [230] 256

War Department Contracts, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 27, [228] 619

Woolwich — Central Arsenal, Observations, Major Beaumont; Reply, Lord Eustace Cecil; short debate thereon *April* 7, [228] 1452

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

Auxiliary Forces

The Militia

1st Somerset Militia, Question, Mr. A. Barclay; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 12, [229] 1665

1st Surrey Militia Regiment, Question, Mr. Freshfield; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 27, [230] 1965

Irish Militia Regiments, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *April* 25, [228] 1627

Militia Adjutants, Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 22, [227] 674; Observations, Viscount Emlyn; Reply, Mr. Stanley; short debate thereon *Mar* 9, 1767; Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 27, [228] 1759; Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 9, [229] 262; *July* 20, [230] 1621

Militia Ballot Act, Question, General Shute; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 30, [229] 1417

Militia Paymasters, Question, The Earl of Sandwich; Answer, Earl Cadogan *July* 3, [230] 847

Militia Quartermasters—Retiring Allowances, Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 24, [227] 814; Observations, Mr. W. Price; Reply, Mr. Stanley *Mar* 2, 1235

Militia Staff Sergeants—Pensions—Retiring Allowances, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 24, [227] 812; Question, Mr. Dease; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 30, [229] 1424; Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 10, [230] 1172

Militia Storehouses in Middlesex, Question, Mr. Coope; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 15, [229] 1894

Militia Surgeons—Compensation, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 7, [231] 697;—*The Regulations*, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 21, [227] 557; Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 18, [229] 919; Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 10, [231] 970

Queen's County Militia Regiments, Question, Mr. Dease; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 30, [229] 1424

Stafford Militia, Question, Colonel Dyott *June* 14, [229] 1821

Supplies to Militia Regiments, Question, Mr. Dease; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 18, [229] 926

The Londonderry Militia, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 10, [228] 1484 [See *Army Mobilization*]

Volunteers and Yeomanry

Volunteer Adjutants — Retiring Allowances, Question, Mr. Brogden; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 9, [227] 1710

Volunteer Review in Hyde Park, Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *June* 27, [230] 501; Question, Observations, Lord Elcho; Reply, Lord Henry Lennox *June* 29, 622

[*cont.*

ARMY—*Auxiliary Forces*—cont.

The Bucks Yeomanry, Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 3, [231] 419

Yeomanry Adjutants, Question, Mr. Ridley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 1, [228] 1908

Yeomanry Trumpeters, Question, Observations, The Duke of St. Albans; Reply, Earl Cadogan; short debate thereon *May* 26, [229] 1254; Question, Viscount Galway; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 22, [230] 247; Question, Viscount Newport; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 3, 851

Army—Army Estimates

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the interests of the Nation do not demand an increased expenditure on the Land Forces" (*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*) *v.*, [227] 1439; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 192, N. 63; M. 129

Army—Army Recruiting

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 2, To leave out from "That," and add "the inducements to enter the ranks of the Army ought to be increased" (*Captain Nolan*) *v.*, [227] 1209; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to
[See *Army—Miscellaneous Questions*]

Army—Knightsbridge Barracks

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 9, To leave out from "That," and add "this House ought not to be asked to vote the first instalment of £100,000 for the proposed reconstruction of Knightsbridge Barracks without the plans prepared by Mr. Wyatt being first produced, and sufficient time being allowed for their consideration by Members" (*Mr. Reginald Yorke*) *v.*, [227] 1760; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 195, N. 46; M. 149

Army—Our Military Forces

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 25, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the present condition of the British Army is most unsatisfactory, and its cost extravagant; that our present practice of retaining men in barracks for Home Service longer than is necessary to make them efficient and thorough soldiers is vicious and immoral; and that, having regard to the efficient defence of the Country, it is inexpedient to maintain two rival paid forces in the United Kingdom" (*Mr. John Holms*) *v.*, [227] 929; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Army—Pay of Soldiers and Marines

Moved, "That, while recognizing the necessity for increased expenditure on the Army, in consequence of the largely increased inducements of the labour market, this House is of

[*cont.*

Army—Pay of Soldiers and Marines—cont.
opinion that it is inexpedient to provide for the Militia Service, without having before the House a detailed statement of the mode of application of the largely increased sum for deferred pay and increased pay, and of its total amount for the present and for future years; and that no measure for increasing the efficiency of the Army is complete that does not include an improvement of the Militia Reserve and the diminution of the present competition between the Line and the Militia for the same class of men" (*Sir Henry Havelock*) *Mar* 9, [227] 1771; short debate thereon

Army—The Reserves
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Papers showing why the conditions of service in the fifth paragraph of the Regulations for the Discipline and Payment of the Army Reserve, that the provisions of the Mutiny Act and Articles of War should apply to the Force whenever it is called out for training and exercise, were not carried out from 1871 to 2nd March 1876; and for any Papers showing how many men of the 1st Class Army Reserve have been invalided" (*The Lord Strathnairn*) *August* 7, [231] 670; after debate, on Question? resolved in the negative

Army Corps Training Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Hardy, Mr. Stanley, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 1 [Bill 182]
229] Read 2°, after short debate *June* 12, 1751
Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 13, 1764
Committee—R.P. *June* 13, 1781
Committee*; Report *June* 15
Considered *June* 16, 2023
Read 3°* *June* 19
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl Cadogan*) *June* 20 (No. 128)
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *June* 22
Read 3ª* *June* 26
Royal Assent *June* 27 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 43]

Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act—Returns
Question, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 12, [229] 1668
Return—(*Parl. P.* 294)

ASHBURY, Mr. J. L., *Brighton*
Births and Deaths, Registration of—Medical Certificates, [228] 71

ASHLEY, Hon. A. Evelyn, *Poole*
Bank of England—Loans Act—Suez Canal Shares, [228] 270, 351
County Court Holidays, [228] 1473
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [229] 1182; Bill withdrawn, [230] 1925, 1939
Egypt—Red Sea Boundary, [230] 1809
Elementary Education, 2R. [229] 1905
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 734
Mercantile Marine—Lighthouses, [228] 469
[*cont.*

ASHLEY, Hon. A. Evelyn—*cont.*
Merchant Shipping Comm. *cl.* 9, [228] 1368, 1369; *cl.* 15, 1592; Amendt. 1613, 1615; *add. cl.* 1929; *add. cl.* [229] 79, 94; Consid. *add. cl.* 1060
Navy—Captain Sulivan, Res. [230] 1314
Parliament—Public Business, [230] 1913
Parliament, Acts of—Report of Select Committee, Res. [228] 571
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 412
Suez Canal Shares—Payment of Interest, [229] 1521
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, [227] 298
Turkey—Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [230] 1184, 1961; [231] 1078
Herzegovina, Consular Memorandum on, [230] 1480

Asia, Central—Khanate of Khokand
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of all Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Russian Government respecting the occupation by Russia of the Khanate of Khokand; and of any Reports of Captain Napier or other Officers on the frontier states" (*Mr. Baillie Cochrane*) *v.*, [229] 107; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

ASSHETON, Mr. R., *Clitheroe*
Commons, Consid. [230] 136
County Palatine of Lancaster (Clerk of the Peace), 2R. [227] 336
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [231] 1149
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [228] 45
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England), Res. [229] 1286
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 14, [230] 1455; *cl.* 20, 1499
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), 2R. [230] 340
Parliament—Derby Day, [229] 1431
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1768
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 539
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 597
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 335

ASTLEY, Sir J., *Lincolnshire, N.*
Drugging of Animals, 2R. [227] 1491

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir J. HOLKER), *Preston*
230] Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. 1153; *cl.* 3, 1159; *cl.* 6, 1161, 1162
231] 763, 766, 768; *cl.* 7, 769; *cl.* 8, *ib.*; *cl.* 13, 772, 773; Consid. 858, 866; *add. cl.* 868, 870, 871, 872, 873, 880; *cl.* 13, 883, 884, 885
Bankruptcy Laws—Legislation, [227] 2013
Barristers and Advocates Fees, 2R. [229] 346
Cheques on Bankers, Leave, [227] 319
Commons, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1573
County Court Holidays, [228] 1473
[*cont.*

Attorney General, The—*cont.*
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1936
Criminal Law — Quarter Sessions — Juries' Summons, [228] 1577
Crossed Cheques, 3R. [231] 1215; Amendt. 1218; Re-comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. *ib.* 1219; *cl.* 5, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 12, Amendt. *ib.*, 1220, 1221
Divorce, Law of, [229] 667
Elections, Corrupt Practices at, [229] 918
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 20, [230] 1500; *cl.* 27, 1506, 1507
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1159
"Empress," Title of—Dublin, Corporation of, [229] 40
European Assurance Society Arbitration, [229] 1038
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 717, 743
Homicide Law Amendment, 2R. [227] 1657
Judicature Act, 1873—Official Referees—Fees, [230] 1817;—Surrey Assizes, [227] 302
Judicature Acts—Assizes, The, [229] 1187;—Issues of Fact in Chancery, [230] 1816;—Jurymen, [227] 480
Law and Justice—"Kimberley v. Crossley"—Costs, [228] 964
Mercantile Marine—"Locksley Hall," The, [229] 368
228] Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, 896, 900; *cl.* 4, 910, 911; *cl.* 5, 1157, 1159; *cl.* 9, 1369; *cl.* 14, 1586, 1589; *cl.* 15, 1601; *cl.* 19, 1881; *cl.* 21, 1884; *add. cl.* 1921, 1941, 1942
229] *add. cl.* 57, 66, 225, 233
231] Lords' Amendts. Consid. 1178
Navy—Officers holding Civil Appointments, [229] 37
Norwich and Boston (Corrupt Voters), Comm. [231] 1055
Offences against the Person, 2R. [227] 141; Comm. 334; [228] 1623
Parliament — Privilege — Lords Lieutenant, [230] 854
Parliament, Acts of—Report of Select Committee, Res. [228] 578
Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868—Boston Election, [228] 349, 350, 1480
Patent Laws—Legislation, [227] 484
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 414
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 603
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 300, 301, 306, 307, 331, 1985
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [227] 1848; [229] 1329, 1333
Trade Marks Registration Act, 1875, [229] 40
United States — Winslow Extradition Case, [229] 45
Unreformed Municipal Corporations (England and Wales), Res. [227] 1153

Backhouse, Mr. E., *Darlington*
Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1516

Bagge, Sir W., *Norfolk, W.*
Merchant Shipping Act—"Strathclyde" Collision—Tug "Palmerston," [230] 336

Balfour, Major-General Sir G., *Kincardineshire*
Appropriation Act, [231] 966
Ardglass Harbour Improvement, Comm. [230] 1762
Army—Mobilization Scheme, The New, [230] 379
Pay of Soldiers and Marines, [227] 1772
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 987
Army and Navy Expenditure Accounts, Audit of, [229] 2005
Army and Navy Expenditure, 1874-5, Comm. [231] 657; Amendt. 659, 660
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1472
Militia Pay and Allowances, [227] 1775
Warlike and other Stores, [229] 1639
Army Purchase Estimate—Army Purchase Commission, [229] 2022
Burghs and Populous Places (Scotland) Gas Supply, 2R. [228] 5
Burghs (Division into Wards) (Scotland) Amendment, 3R. [229] 1782
Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 141, 142
Ceylon—Breakwater at Trincomalee, [230] 1049
China, Res. [230] 561, 562
Civil Departments (Employment of Soldiers), Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1993
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 1, [231] 979; *cl.* 4, 981
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1217
Dover Harbour, [229] 1346
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [231] 1036
Erne Lough and River, Comm. [230] 1763
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1637
Harbours of Refuge—Dover, [231] 973
Harbours of Refuge—North-East Coast, Res. [231] 33
India—Duties on Manufactures, [229] 36
Malay Peninsula—Birch, Mr., Murder of, [229] 1300
India—Bengal Famine, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1859
India, Council of, (Pensions), Res. [227] 238
India—War Office Charges, [231] 117; Res. 653
India Tariff Act—Correspondence, [228] 1627
Indian Legislation, 2R. [227] 467
Local Taxation—Queenborough, [230] 1397
Navy—Royal Marines, [228] 1522
Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [228] 1550
Parliament—Order—Debates in the House of Lords, Reference to, [229] 1624, 1625
Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 622
Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1447
Queenborough Harbour, 3R. [229] 1968
Supply—Army Purchase Commission, [228] 1879
War Office on account of India, [228] 341
Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1941

Balfour, Mr. A. J., *Hertford*
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [231] 1033

Bandon, Earl of
Grand Juries (Ireland), Res. [229] 1413

Bankers Books Evidence Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Backhouse, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Watkin Williams*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 29 [Bill 171]
Read 2°, after short debate *June* 8, [229] 1597
Committee*—R.P. *June* 15
Committee*; Report *June* 22
230] Considered *July* 3, 937
Read 3°* *July* 6
l. Read 1^a* (*Lord Aberdare*) *July* 7 (No. 159)
Read 2^a, after short debate *July* 17, 1470
Committee* *July* 21
Report* *July* 24
Read 3^a* *July* 25
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 48]

Bankers Deposits—Financial Panics
Moved, "That this House is of opinion that Her Majesty's Government should take into its early consideration whether it would not be for the advantage of the Country that a moderate and graduated stamp or composition Duty should be levied in respect to all interest-bearing deposits with bankers in the United Kingdom, and whether the scale and incidence of such Duty may not be so devised as to encourage the making of such deposits for fixed periods and renewable periods, as for instance from three months to three months, in preference to the system which has grown up and now prevails, whereby the greater number and amount of the interest-bearing deposits in the United Kingdom are held subject to recall at a few days' notice" (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*) *May* 16, [229] 778; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Bank of England—The Loans Act—The Suez Canal Shares
Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, [228] 269; Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 351

Bankrupt Banks, 1844-1875—*Defective Returns*
Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 20, [230] 128
(*Parl. P.* 115)

Bankruptcy Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1^a, after short debate *June* 1, [229] 1496 (No. 106)
Read 2^a, after short debate *June* 22, [230] 234
Order for Committee discharged; Bill withdrawn, after short debate *June* 29, 610

Bankruptcy Laws—Legislation
Question, Mr. Bell; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 14, [227] 2013

Banks of Issue—Re-Appointment of Committee
Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 21, [227] 555; *Mar* 21, [228] 352

Banns of Marriage (Scotland) Bill
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Barclay, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Edward Jenkins*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 27]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 21, [230] 183
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Orr Ewing*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 141, N. 166; M. 25
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

Barbadoes
Reported Disturbances, Questions, Sir Charles
W. Dilke, Mr. Thornhill; Answers, Mr. J.
228] Lowther *April* 25, 1627; Question, Mr.
W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Disraeli
April 27, 1763; Question, Observations,
Lord Blachford; Reply, The Earl of Carnarvon; short debate thereon *April* 28,
1817; Question, Mr. Thornhill; Answer,
Mr. J. Lowther *April* 28, 1834; Question,
Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. J. Low-
229] ther *May* 4, 43; Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 9, 265;—*The
Riots,* Question, Mr. Thornhill; Answer,
230] Mr. J. Lowther *July* 11, 1281; Question,
Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 24,
1811; Observations, Earl Granville, The
231] Earl of Carnarvon *July* 28, 2; Question,
Mr. Thornhill; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther
August 7, 702
Governor Hennessy—The Speeches and Documents, Observations, Mr. Charley; Reply, Mr. J. Lowther; debate thereon *May* 5, [229] 144
Flogging in, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 6, [228] 1323
Social and Political Condition, Observations, Mr. E. Jenkins; Reply, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 28, [231] 42; Observations, The Earl of Carnarvon; short debate thereon *August* 1, 236
Papers . . . . [1539] [1559]
Inland Revenue . . . . . *P.P.* 438

BARCLAY, Mr. J. W., *Forfarshire*
Army—Somersetshire Militia, 1st, [229] 1665
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps, Pay and Allowances, [227] 1777
Burgesses (Scotland), Comm. [227] 1779
Cattle Disease (Ireland), [227] 402; 2R. 1778
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2042
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1216
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Res. [229] 1284
Egypt—National Bank, The proposed, [228] 627
Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Report, [227] 1870; [228] 74

[*cont.*

Barclay, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*
Factory and Workshops Commission, Report, [228] 618
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1623, 1639
Intestates (Scotland) Act, [227] 818
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 666
Merchant Shipping, Consid. *cl.* 18, [229] 1072
Offences against the Person, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 1784
Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 259
Scotch Fisheries, [227] 1418
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 514
Fishery Board in Scotland, [227] 991; Amendt. 992, 993
Local Government Board, &c., Motion for reporting Progress, [227] 519, 521
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, [227] 1842
Lunacy Commission, Scotland, [227] 994
Wild Fowl Preservation, 2R. Amendt. [227] 789; Comm. [229] 1661; 3R. 1884

Baring, Mr. T. C., *Essex, S.*
Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London), Comm. [231] 932; Amendt. 1185

Barristers and Advocates Fees Bill
(*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Anderson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 18]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 10, [229] 307
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir Henry Jackson*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 130, N. 237; M. 107
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Barttelot, Colonel Sir W. B., *Sussex, W*
Army — Patented Inventions — Small Arms [230] 1479
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 947
Army Corps Training, Consid. [229] 2023
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1268
Military Education, Establishments for, [229] 1654
Pay and Allowances to Land Forces, [227] 1487
Volunteer Corps—Pay and Allowances, [227] 1777
Warlike and other Stores, Amendt. [229] 1636, 1646
Commons, Comm. [229] 1384; *cl.* 2, 1391; *cl.* 8, 1530
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2062
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [231] 1148
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 976
Education Code—Subjects, Choice of, Res. [227] 1806
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1466
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1291, 1294; *cl.* 5, 1297; *cl.* 11, 1443; *cl.* 14, 1456; *add. cl.* 1537, 1672; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 480; *cl.* 28, 556
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R., Previous Question moved, [227] 347

[*cont.*

Barttelot, Colonel Sir W. B.—*cont.*
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. Amendt. [229] 867, 878
Law and Justice—Wilberforce, Mr., Case of, Res. [228] 2012, 2016
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 55
Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1604
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 9
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [227] 472
Prisons, 2R. [230] 297
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 505
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 351
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1319
New Courts of Justice and Offices, [229] 1591
Surveys of the United Kingdom, [229] 1589

Bass, Mr. M. A., *Stafford, E.*
Metropolitan Fire Brigade—Fire at Chelsea, [230] 1625

Bass, Mr. M. T., *Derby Bo.*
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1576
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1178
Municipal Officers Superannuation (No. 2), 2R. [227] 328
Railway Accident Commission — Frederick Harcombe, Case of, [229] 1518

Bates, Mr. E., *Plymouth*
Mercantile Marine—"Lily of Devon," The, [229] 925
Thames Police Court, Decision at, [228] 1837
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 76, 82, 91, 93, 231; Lords Amendts. Consid. [231] 1179; Amendt. 1181
Navy—Royal Marines, [228] 1524
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 855
United States—"Alabama" Award, [229] 927

Bath, Marquess of
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 21, [230] 1431
Turkey—Treaties of 1856, Res. [231] 106
University of Oxford, Comm. *cl.* 12, [228] 939

Baxter, Right Hon. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 200, 201
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 21
Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 438
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 720
Navy—Henwood, Mr. Charles Frederick, Case of, Motion for a Select Committee, [229] 1616
Poor Law Expenditure (Scotland), [227] 817

[*cont.*

Baxter, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Poor Law (Scotland), Comm. Amendt. [230] 504
Post Office—Miscellaneous Questions
Mails to the United States, [230] 1393
North American Mails, [228] 63
Post Office Cheques, [227] 258
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 589
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 506, 507, 510
Turkey—Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [230] 1476, 1679

Bazley, Sir T., *Manchester*
Coroners, Res. [230] 1313
Poor Law—Workhouse Sunday Services (Oldham), [228] 625

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks- (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *Gloucestershire, E.*
Animals, Cruelty to, [227] 1295
Cattle Disease (Ireland), [227] 402 ; 2R. 1778 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1037 ; Amendt. [229] 182 ; *cl.* 4, *ib.*, 183 ; [230] 1677 ; *cl.* 5, 1678 ; *cl.* 7, *ib.* ; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1679 ; Consid. 2022
Clerk of the Peace and of the Crown (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1339
Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [228] 458
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 1, [231] 979
County Rates (Ireland), 2R. [229] 306
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 783
Erne Lough and River, Comm. [230] 1764
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Adulterated Drinks at Fairs, Sale of, [228] 65
Bankruptcy Jurisdiction, [227] 2012
Cattle Disease—Pleuro-Pneumonia—Compulsory Slaughter, [230] 254
Civil Bill Processes, [228] 696
Constabulary, [230] 1808 ;—County Mayo, [228] 1830 ;—James Brannigan, Case of, [227] 560 ;—North Riding of Tipperary, [228] 771
Convict Prisons, [230] 736
Coroner, Office of, [228] 475
County Prisons, [229] 1423
Crime in—Returns, [228] 267
Criminal Law—Canvassing Jurors, [230] 1974 ;—Christos Baumbos, The Convict, [231] 817 ;—James Timony, Case of, [230] 853 ;—Kerry Assizes, [228] 470 ;—Kirwan, The Convict, [231] 424
Deputy Clerks of the Peace, [228] 1096
Dogs Regulation Act, 1868—Petty Sessions Clerks, [231] 1200
Dublin, Corporation of, [231] 1230 ;—St. Stephen's Green, [230] 1883
Education Board—The Staff, [230] 951
Education, Intermediate, [227] 263 ;—Irish National School Teachers, [229] 1349 ;—"Results Examination," [228] 473 ; [230] 868
Fisheries—Cape Clear Island, [230] 253 ;—Galway Bay, Trawling Vessels in, 1171 ; [228] 1408

[*cont.*

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-—*cont.*
Government Advertisements in, [231] 816
Grand Jury System—Legislation, [227] 483
Inspectors of Irish Fisheries—The Annual Reports, 230] 1966 ;—Bye-Laws, [231] 1201 ;—Gunboat, 1073
Intemperance, [227] 1866
Irish Church Body — Emly Cathedral Church, [230] 1885
Irish Church Temporalities Commission, [228] 766 ;—Church Lands, [227] 1293 ;—National Monuments in Ireland, [231] 694
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners, [228] 1403
Irish Churchyards, [229] 369
Irish Fisheries Act—Licences, [228] 696
Judicature—Court of Common Pleas, [231] 1154
Kilbarry Marsh, [230] 5
Labourers' Dwellings, [231] 1197
Land Owners, [230] 1047
Land Owners of Ireland — "Domesday Book," [227] 1208, 1209, 1799
Law and Justice—Legal Offices, Union of, [227] 1800 ;—Mr. Serjeant Armstrong, [230] 1140, 1176
Law Appointments—James Devine, Case of, [229] 1350
Licensing Act, 1872 — Publicans' Signboards, [228] 561
Lunatic Asylums, [229] 1193
Magistrates—Orange Meeting, Speech at, [229] 168, 171
Model Schools, [229] 920
National Board of Education—Inspectors' Reports, [230] 615
National Education — Teachers' Salaries, [228] 1832, 1910
National School Teachers, [227] 404 ;—Contributory Unions, 1294 ;—Michael Moyna, Case of, [230] 421
National Schools, [229] 46
Peace Preservation Acts—County of Louth, [230] 1627
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act — Proclaimed Districts, [227] 2013 ; [228] 271
Poor Law—Clifden Union, [229] 487 ;—Kilmacthomas Workhouse, [228] 1404 ;—South Dublin Workhouse, [230] 1812 ;—Union Workhouses, [231] 515
Primary Education, [227] 1122
Prisons, [227] 264 ; [230] 1964
Protection of Life and Property (Ireland) Act, 1871—Meath, County of, [227] 561
Public Health—Dublin, [228] 1179, 1910 ;—Vaccine Lymph, [227] 1021
Public Houses, [227] 1121
Queen's Colleges, [229] 487
Sheriffs—Levies, Retention of, [229] 773
Sunday Drinking—Return, [227] 1419
Thurles Coronership, [230] 248
Upper Shannon, The, [230] 1171 ;—Ballyconnell Canal, [229] 1036
Workhouse Schools, [227] 1711
Ireland—An Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 801, 802, 803, 808
Ireland—Blackwater Fishery, Res. [230] 1332
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [228] 751
Ireland—Common Pleas—Resignation of Chief Justice, Motion for a Paper, [231] 1232, 1233

[*cont.*

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. **Hicks**—*cont.*
- Ireland—Constabulary Pensioners, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 571
- Ireland—National School Teachers Act, 1875, Res. [228] 242;—Non-Contributory Unions, 1986
- Ireland—Peace Preservation Acts, Res. [228] 1243
- Ireland—Phœnix Park (Dublin)—Whitefield Lodge, Motion for Papers, [231] 1223
- Ireland—Poor Law Rating, Res. [229] 842
- Ireland—Public Houses—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 417, 528, 560
- Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—Mr. John Croker, Res. [229] 1437, 1440, 1441, 1442
- Irish Land Act—Compensation under 3rd Clause, [227] 135

229] Jurors Qualification (Ireland), 2R. 1753
230] Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 141, 142; *cl.* 3,
. Amendt. *ib.*; Schedule 1, 143, 144, 146;
. Schedule 3, 147; Schedule 4, *ib.*; Post-
. poned Schedule 1, Amendt. 268; Amendt.
. 271, 272, 273; 3R. Amendt. 338, 339, 341

- Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 812, 814
- Local Taxation, [227] 1123
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 220
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1181, 1183
- Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. [227] 469, 929
- Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 992
- Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1636, 1638
- Poor Law Rating (Ireland), 2R. [229] 2024
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1335, 1524; Comm. [231] 357
- Supply—Chief Secretary for Ireland Offices, [227] 1843
  - Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 340
  - Civil Services (Further Vote on Account), [230] 822
  - Constabulary (Ireland), [228] 593
  - Local Government Board, &c. [227] 517
  - Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, [227] 1841
  - Pauper Lunatics (Ireland), [227] 1846
  - Public Education (Ireland), [231] 269, 275, 279
  - Public Works in Ireland, [227] 1844
  - Report, [228] 688
  - Revenue Departments, [228] 1877
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 361, 364
- University Education (Ireland), Leave, [229] 825

Beach, Mr. W. W. B., *Hampshire, N.*
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2034

Beauchamp, Earl (Lord Steward of the Household)
- Criminal Law—Throwing Stones at Railway Trains, [229] 1342
- Parliament—Queen's Speech—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, [227] 124
- Prevention of Crimes Act Amendment, 2R. [230] 485

Beauchamp, Earl—*cont.*
- Sulphurous Acid—Her Majesty's Answer to Address, [228] 1745
- Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 762
- United Parishes (Scotland), [228] 57

Beaumont, Major F. E. B., *Durham, S.*
- Army—Line and Scientific Corps—Garrison of Belfast, [230] 1970
  - Ordnance Corps, Promotion in the, [227] 482
- Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 971
- Army Estimates, Res. [227] 1455
- Navy—Royal Naval Engineers, [228] 68
- Woolwich Arsenal, [228] 1452, 1453, 1454, 1457

Beaumont, Mr. W. B., *Northumberland, S.*
- Agricultural Holdings (England) Act—Greenwich Hospital Estates, [228] 65

Beer Licences (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Meldon, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Whitworth*)
- *c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 23 [Bill 113]
- 2R. [Dropped]

Bell, Mr. I. L., *Hartlepool*
- Bankruptcy Laws—Legislation, [227] 2013
- Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 447
- Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1364

Belmore, Earl of
- Army—Church Attendance of Soldiers—Payment for Sittings, [227] 1793
- Intemperance, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 729
- Irish Peerage, 2R. [228] 1173; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1901; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1904, 1905
- National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, [229] 359
- Owners of Land (Ireland)—New "Domesday Book," [230] 943
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. [228] 1362; Report, [229] 764
- Trustees, Responsibility of, [228] 1176

Benett-Stanford, Mr. V. F., *Shaftesbury*
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1399
- Metropolis—Cab Shelter in Palace Yard, [229] 48
- Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 297
- Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 620

Bentinck, Mr. G. A. F. Cavendish (Judge Advocate General), *Whitehaven*
- Army—Court Martial on Captain Roberts [230] 1961; [231] 415
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 106, [228] 912, 913

[*cont.*

BENTINCK, Mr. G. W. P., *Norfolk, W.*
Admiralty, The—Civilian First Lords, Res. [227] 1873
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 845
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [227] 454; Comm. [228] 527; *cl.* 18, 1805; Lords Amendts. [231] 1169
Navy—Anchors, [228] 1479
H.M.S. "Serapis," Accident to, [227] 1708
Navy, Administration of the, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 446
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1077
Navy—Navigation of Her Majesty's Ships, Res. [228] 1655
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [230] 469
Scientific Departments, [230] 460
Seamen and Marines, [228] 1545
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [227] 115
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [227] 472

BERESFORD, Lord C. W. D., *Waterford Co.*
Navy, Administration of the, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 449
Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. [230] 177
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 342
Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [231] 277

BERESFORD, Colonel F. M., *Southwark*
Army—Moncrieff System of Artillery, [230] 419
Regimental Exchanges, [230] 1178
Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1052
Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [228] 1206
Mercantile Marine—Life Saving Apparatus, [231] 120
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 62, 68, 69, 71; Consid. *add. cl.* 1060
Metropolis—Victoria Embankment, [227] 1867
Navy—Shipbuilding, Tenders for, [230] 1177
Navy—Henwood, Mr. Charles, Petition of, Res. [227] 1404; [228] 342, 344; [229] 1038; Motion for a Select Committee, 1609, 1610, 1619, 1763
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1600
Rivers Pollution, [229] 45
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 638
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1139

BERESFORD, Mr. G. De La P., *Armagh*
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 788

BIGGAR, Mr. J. G., *Cavan Co.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland), Lords Amendts. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 1272
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1127

[*cont.*

BIGGAR, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Army—King George of Hanover, [230] 256
Bishopric of Truro, Consid. [231] 27
Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, Motion for Adjournment, [229] 183; [230] 1677; *cl.* 5, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1678; Consid. Amendt. 2021
Church Temporalities Commissioners (Ireland), [228] 1403
Clerk of the Peace and of the Crown (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1338
Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1045
Egypt—Suez Canal Shares, [229] 1417
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 552
Irish Church Temporalities, Motion for Returns, [228] 766
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 146, 270, 271, 273; 3R. 340
Law and Justice—Wilberforce, Mr., Case of, Res. [228] 2010
Magistrates (Ireland)—Orange Meeting, Speech at, [229] 171
Merchant Shipping Acts—Merchant Seamen Deserters, [230] 422
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. [227] 1942, 1943
Poor Law Amendment, Consid. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 483
Post Office Savings Banks, [229] 1665
Privilege—Messrs. Rothschild, [227] 1019
Public Works Loans, Comm. [230] 981
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 512
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 363
Turkey—Eastern Question, The, [230] 876
Naval Force in Turkish Waters, [230] 1960

BIRLEY, Mr. H., *Manchester*
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [228] 44
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm, [231] 1034
229] Elementary Education, Leave, 960; 2R. 1929, 1938
230] Comm. *cl.* 4, 1289; *cl.* 6, 1405; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1414; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1449; Amendt. 1450; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1451; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1496, 1497; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 1505; Postponed *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1530; *add. cl.* 1657
231] Schedule 1, Amendt. 69; Consid, *cl.* 14, 477, 491; 3R. 573
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1271
Elementary Education Act—Cardiff School Board, [229] 47
Pollution of Rivers, 3R. [231] 561

Bishopric of Truro Bill—*Formerly* Diocese of Exeter Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *June* 8, [229] 1601; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 185]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 4, [230] 984; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *July* 21, 1761

[*cont.*

Bishopric of Truro Bill—cont.

- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 75, N. 23; M. 52
- Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
- Committee*—R.P. *July* 24
- Committee*—R.P. *July* 26
- Committee; Report *July* 27, 2021
- Consideration; debate adjourned *July* 28, [231] 27
- Consideration; debate resumed *July* 29, 72; after short debate, Debate further adjourned
- Considered* *July* 31
- Read 3°* *August* 1
- Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *August* 1 (No. 201)
- Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 7, 669
- Committee*; Report *August* 8
- Read 3ª* *August* 9
- Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 54]

BLACHFORD, Lord

- Africa, West Coast of—Exchange of Territory, [227] 388
- Barbadoes, Island of—Reported Disturbances, [228] 1817
- Heligoland, Address for Papers, [227] 1855
- Malay Peninsula, Res. [230] 845
- Owners of Land (Ireland)—New "Domesday Book," [230] 944
- University of Oxford, Comm. *cl.* 16, [228] 1305

BLAKE, Mr. T., *Leominster*

- Criminal Law—Vaccination Act, Arrests under the, [229] 1052
- Salmon Fisheries Act, 1873—Fishery Board, [229] 1893

BLENNERHASSETT, Mr. R., *Kerry*

- Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 710

BOLCKOW, Mr. H. W. F., *Middlesborough*

- Inland Revenue—Grocers Wine and Spirit Licences, [227] 1568

BOORD, Mr. T. W., *Greenwich*

- Civil Service Inquiry Commission—Customs Out-Door Department, [229] 1115
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [231] 60, 66, 67; Consid. *add. cl.* 470
- Elementary Education Act, 1870—Compulsory Attendance—George Beavis, Case of, [227] 227, 228, 229;—John Speers, Case of, 480
- Metropolitan Fire Brigade, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 361, 366
- Plumstead and Wormholt Commons, Res. [231] 827
- Woolwich Arsenal, [228] 1456

Borough Boundaries—Legislation

- Question, Sir Sydney Waterlow; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 14, [227] 2010

Borough Franchise (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. Biggar, Mr. Butt, Mr. Blennerhassett, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Richard Power*)

- c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 17]
- Bill withdrawn* *Feb* 29

BOURKE, Hon. R. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Lynn Regis*

- Africa—Gold Coast—Messrs. Swanzy, [231] 969
- Brazil—Outrage on a British Subject, [227] 403
- Canada, Dominion of—Treaty of Washington, [228] 1407
- Channel Tunnel Scheme, [229] 1666
- China—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Hankow, Outrage at, [229] 44
  - Kiung Chow, Port of, [229] 671
  - Margary, Mr., Murder of—Report of the Mission, [229] 1971
  - Papers, The, [227] 136, 1798
  - Yunnan Mission, [228] 1480;—Report, [231] 117
- China, Res. [230] 565
- Coolies—Réunion, Island of, [228] 478
- Criminal Law—Edward O'Meagher Condon, The Convict, [227] 1025
- Diplomatic and Consular Service—Stockholm, British Vice Consul at, [229] 41
- Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Court of Summary Justice, [230] 1698
  - General Kirkham, Imprisonment of, [230] 1477
  - Ministry of War, [227] 266, 1022
  - National Bank of, [227] 1707
  - Red Sea Boundary, [230] 1810
  - Suez Canal—Sir Daniel Lange, [227] 1207
- England and Portugal, Commercial Relations between, [228] 67
- Foreign Loans, Select Committee on—Honduras Minister, [227] 136
- France—Sugar Convention, 1875, [230] 737
- France and the United States—Reported Commercial Treaty, [231] 116
- Fugitive Slave Circulars, [227] 230
- Germany—Prince Bismarck and Count Arnim, [228] 875
- Greece—"Agrigento" and the "Hylton Castle," [229] 1762; [231] 1206
- Hertslet's Map of Europe by Treaty—Non-European Countries, [231] 517
- Holland—Sugar Duties, [228] 1479
- India—Malay Peninsula—Perak, State of, [228] 1577
- International Submarine Telegraphs, [228] 476
- Ionian Islands—Treaty of 1864—Article 7—Public Debt, [230] 7
- Italy—Hind, Mr., Murder of, near Naples, [227] 684
  - William Mercer, Case of, [230] 1173
- Japan and Corea, Dispute between, [227] 2014
  - Newspaper Regulations, [228] 478, 1473
- Joint Stock Companies Act—Arrest of an Official Liquidator at Hamburgh, [229] 926
- Korea—Proposed Treaty, [229] 1039
- Mercantile Marine—Merchant Seamen Deserters, [228] 1909
  - Nautical Terms, Uniformity of, [227] 557
- Parliament—Business of the House, [231] 977
- Peru—Guano, [227] 406
- Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 392, 394, 395, 396, 397, 406, 419, 1406, 1634, 1985; [230] 9; Res. [231] 752, 753, 754
- Portugal, Commercial Relations with, [227] 137

BOURKE, Hon. R.—*cont.*
- Roumania—The New Tariff, [230] 852
- Russia and Corea, [228] 171
- Santa Fé—Bullion, Seizure of, [230] 1046
- Slave Trade—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Mozambique, [230] 128
  - Red Sea, [230] 869, 1137, 1815
  - Sultan of Zanzibar, [228] 72 ; [229] 1117 ; [230] 249
- Slave Trade (East Africa), Res. [228] 1221
- Spain—Miscellaneous Questions
  - British Subjects, Detention of, [229] 1272
  - "Clementina," The, [229] 489
  - Constitution, Article 11—Religious Toleration, [230] 6
  - Cuba—Chinese Coolies, [230] 616 ;—Tax on Foreigners, 867
  - Justice, Miscarriage of—Murder of a British Subject, [228] 1626
  - "Octavia," Seizure of the, [228] 1912 ; [229] 1113
  - Sloop "Lark," Seizure of the, [228] 702
  - Tonnage Dues, [227] 813
  - War Taxes on British Subjects, [228] 1322 ; [231] 695
- Sugar Convention, 1864—Holland, [227] 562
- Sugar Convention, 1875—Dutch Chamber, Refusal by the, [228] 74
- Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1467, 1468
  - Report, [229] 1757 ;—Suez Canal—Modification of Dues, [228] 1574
- Sweden—Stockholm, British Church at, [228] 1475 ; [231] 121
- Treaty of Vienna, 1815—Polish Language, [231] 820
- Treaty of Washington — Canadian Fishery Commission, [230] 258
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Bagdad, Plague in, [230] 427
  - Bosnia and Herzegovina, [227] 406
  - Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [230] 1698, 1961 ; [231] 734, 876, 877, 1107, 1111
  - Eastern Question—Roumania, [230] 1527 ; —The Papers, [229] 1424
  - Herzegovina, Consular Memorandum on, [230] 1480
  - Salonica, Murder of the Consuls at, [229] 1114 ;—Correspondence, [230] 1820
  - Servia—Revolted Provinces, [230] 737, 950
  - Turkish Finance, [229] 1354
- United States—Miscellaneous Questions
  - "Alabama" Claims, The, [228] 1481
  - Extradition Treaties, [227] 673 ; [229] 107 ; [231] 424
  - General Schenck, [227] 1798
  - Winslow Extradition Case, [229] 45, 777, 778, 1668

Bow Street Police Court (Site) Bill

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Secretary Cross*)

c. Ordered * *June* 13
- Read 1°*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 14 [Bill 191]
- Read 2° *, and committed to a Select Committee *July* 11
- Moved, "That the Select Committee do consist of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two to be nominated by the Committee of Selection" *July* 13 ; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Captain Nolan*) ; Question put ; A. 8, N. 92 ; M. 84
- Original Question put, and agreed to
- Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Spencer Stanhope (Chairman), Colonel Blackburne, and Mr. Richard Smyth ; Lord Randolph Churchill and Sir John St. Aubyn nominated by the Committee of Selection
- Ordered, That all Petitions presented against the Bill be referred to the Committee on the Bill, provided such Petitions are presented one clear day before the Meeting of the Committee ; and that such of the Petitioners as pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or agents, be heard upon their Petitions, if they think fit, and Counsel heard in favour of the Bill against the said Petitions :—That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records ; That Three be the quorum (*Mr. William Henry Smith*)
- Report of Select Committee *July* 19
- Question, Mr. Whitwell ; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 20, [230] 1625
- Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *August* 9
- Read 3° * *August* 10 . [Bill 257]

l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *August* 11 (No. 228)
- Read 2ª * ; Committee negatived *August* 12
- Read 3ª * *August* 14
- Royal Assent *Aug* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxxviii]

Bow Street Police Court (Site) Bill—Expenses of Commissioners

c. Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 13 ; Question put ; A. 125, N. 30 ; M. 95
- Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to ; Matter considered in Committee ; a Resolution agreed to

BOWYER, Sir G., *Wexford Co.*
- Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [229] 1708 ; Comm. [230] 984, 1158 ; *cl.* 6, [231] 761 ; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 769 ; *cl.* 13, 773
- Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, Res. [227] 1765
- Barbadoes—Riots—Governor Hennessy, [229] 164
  - Social and Political Condition, [231] 58
- Cheques on Bankers, Leave, [227] 321
- City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1142
- Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 442
- Commons, Comm. [229] 1380
- Crossed Cheques, Re-comm. *cl.* 12, [231] 1221
- Customs—Solicitor, Office of the, [231] 700
- Elementary Education, Consid. [231] 463 ; *cl.* 14, 549 ; 3R. 588
- H.R.H. the Prince of Wales—Nobility of Malta, [229] 670, 1667
- Homicide Law Amendment, 2R. [230] 1942
- Law and Justice—Wilberforce, Mr., Case of, Res. [228] 2019
- London Municipal Government, Res. [229] 1804
- Malta, Taxation in, Res. [229] 1984
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. [228] 538 ; *cl.* 3, 547, 908 ; *cl.* 4, 911

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Bowyer, Sir G.—*cont.*
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1011
Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1604
National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, Res. [228] 233
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 588
Privilege—Public Petitions, Personal Explanation, [229] 586
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [227] 472
Parliament—Privilege—Political Committee of the Reform Club, Res. [229] 1673
Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 418; Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 284, 289, 293, 298, 300, 302, 307
Supply—Mint, including Coinage, [227] 523

Brady, Dr. J., *Leitrim Co.*
Army and Navy Surgeons, [229] 777

Brand, Right Hon. H. B. W., (*see* **Speaker**, The)

Brassey, Mr. T., *Hastings*
Iron-clad Navies, British and Foreign, [227] 1917
Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1812, 1834
Merchant Service Officers, Res. [229] 794, 804
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 662; *cl.* 15, 1600, 1615; *cl.* 26, Amendt. 1914; *add. cl.* 1927, 1939; [229] 70, 71, 79
Navy—Administration of the, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 453
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1085
Navy—Navigation of Her Majesty's Ships, Res. [228] 1648
Navy—Ships of War, Res. [229] 235, 255
Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [228] 1549
Coastguard Service, Naval Reserve, &c., [228] 1553
Dockyards, &c. [230] 469

Brazil—Outrage on a British Subject
Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 17, [227] 403

Briggs, Mr. W. E., *Blackburn*
Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1049
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [231] 1026
Elementary Education Act, 1870 — Pupil Teachers, [228] 877
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 554

Bright, Right Hon. J., *Birmingham*
Art Library, South Kensington, [229] 105
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 758
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1573
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1474

[*cont.*

Bright, Right Hon. J.—cont.
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 27, [230] 1506; *cl.* 28, 1507; *add. cl.* 1669, 1670, 1674, 1718, 1829, 1910; Amendt. 1977, 1991
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1289, 1297
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 302, 314, 316
Land Owners of Ireland—"Domesday Book," [227] 1209, 1798
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1018
Parliament—Derby Day, [229] 1432
Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1638
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1852
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 555
Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 427
Royal Titles Proclamation, [228] 1770, 1771; —Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 402
Turkey—Eastern Question, The, [230] 877
Ministers, Assassination of, [229] 1975
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1730

Bright, Mr. J., *Manchester*
British Honduras, [231] 117
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1851
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 785, 786
Spain—War Taxes in Cuba, [231] 694
Turkey — Bulgaria, Reported Atrocities in, [231] 753
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1345
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1688

Brise, Colonel S. B. **Ruggles-**, *Essex, E.*
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Res. [229] 1286
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1291; *cl.* 6, 1405; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1498

Bristowe, Mr. S. B., *Newark*
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1391; *cl.* 8, 1528; *cl.* 12, 1534; Consid. [230] 132; Amendt. 133
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1215
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [230] 1414; Amendt. 1415, 1417; *cl.* 20, 1500; Postponed *cl.* 8, 1530; *add. cl.* 1848; Consid. *cl.* 14, Motion for Adjournment, [231] 495; Amendt. 547
University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1112
University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1739

British Honduras
Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 31, [231] 117

British Museum
Salaries, Question, Mr. W. M. Torrens; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 24, [228] 1576; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 3, [230] 858
The Reading Rooms, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 10, [228] 1476
Returns—*P.P.* 416

BROGDEN, Mr. A., *Wednesbury*
- Army—Volunteer Adjutants, [227] 1710
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [231] 25

BROOKS, Mr. M., *Dublin*
- Criminal Law—Fenian Prisoners, [227] 1718
  - Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1040, 1049
- Elementary Education Act, 1870—"Godless Education," [228] 267
- Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1204
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Dublin — St. Stephen's Green, [230] 612, 1882
  - Ireland, Government Advertisements in, [231] 816
  - Irish Fishery Inspectors—Gunboat, [231] 1073
  - Registry of Deeds (Dublin), [229] 1117
- Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [228] 743
- Ireland—Public Houses—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 566
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1180, 1181
- Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. [227] 468; Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [231] 662; *cl.* 4, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 663; *cl.* 12, 664, 774
- Post Office Telegraph—Special Wires, [231] 815, 816
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1334; Comm. Amendt. [231] 330
- Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [231] 278

BROOKS, Mr. W. C., *Cheshire, E.*
- Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1344

BROWN, Mr. A. H., *Wenlock*
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [229] 1529; *cl.* 12, 1533
- 230] Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1401; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1413; *cl.* 11, Motion for reporting Progress, 1420; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1450; Postponed *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1531; *add. cl.* 1535, 1718, 2001
- 231] 22
- Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1640
- Poor Law—Out-Door Relief, [229] 1425
- Public Health—Water—Impure and Deficient Supply, [231] 6
- Rivers Pollution Commission — The Report, [230] 384

BROWN, Mr. J. C., *Horsham*
- Army Mobilization—Irish Militia, [230] 1698

BRUCE, Right Hon. Lord E. A. C. B., *Marlborough*
- Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [227] 814;—Traffic at, [229] 1273; [231] 1199
  - Streets, Re-paving of, [227] 815

BRUCE, Hon. T. C., *Portsmouth*
- Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [230] 459
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Berlin Conference, [229] 1053
  - Bosnia and Herzegovina, [227] 406; [230] 1170
  - Eastern Question, The, [230] 255
  - Salonica Murders — Correspondence, [230] 1821, 1822
- Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Res. [231] 126, 225

BRUEN, Mr. H., *Carlow Co.*
- Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 446
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2066
- Ireland—County Prisons — Legislation, [229] 1423
  - Criminal Law Canvassing Jurors, [230] 1974
- Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [228] 715, 717
- Ireland—National School Teachers Act, 1875, Res. [228] 235
- Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker), Res. [229] 1434, 1442
- Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 144, 270; Motion for reporting Progress, 272, 273; 3R. 338, 341
- Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 988
- Poor Law Amendment, Comm. [228] 1470
- Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 18
- Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 340

Brussels International Exhibition
- Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, [230] 1886
- *Transport of Sick and Wounded Soldiers,* Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 17, [230] 1477

BUCCLEUCH, Duke of
- Clean Rivers, 2R. [230] 1881
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [230] 1431
- Publicans Certificates (Scotland), 2R. [229] 484; Comm. *cl.* 13, [230] 104
- Royal Titles — Personal Explanation, [228] 689

BULWER, Mr. J. R., *Ipswich*
- Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. [231] 866
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1412; *cl.* 7, 1417
- Merchant Shipping—Lords' Amendts. Consid. [231] 1179

Burgesses (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Yeaman*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 48]
- Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 1, [227] 1188
- Committee *—R.P. *Mar* 3
- Committee—R.P., after short debate *Mar* 9, 1779

[*cont.*

Burgesses (Scotland) Bill—cont.
Committee*; Report *Mar* 13
Considered * *Mar* 16
Read 3° * *Mar* 17
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Airlie*) *Mar* 20 (No. 35)
Read 2ª *Mar* 23, [228] 466
Committee *; Report *Mar* 27
Read 3ª * *April* 4
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 12]

Burghs (Division into Wards) (Scotland) Amendment Bill

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 24 [Bill 166]
Read 2° *May* 26, 1339
Committee *; Report *June* 8
Read 3°, after short debate *June* 13, [229] 1782
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 15
Read 2ª * *June* 19 (No. 116)
Committee * *June* 22
Report * *June* 23
Read 3ª * *June* 26
Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 25]

Burghs (Scotland) Gas Supply Bill

(*Sir Windham Anstruther, Mr. Orr Ewing, Mr. Grieve, Mr. William Holms*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 5]
Read 2°, after short debate, and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 15, [228] 3
And, on *Mar* 21, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Massey (Chairman), Sir Windham Anstruther, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Cawley, Mr. Dundas, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Grieve, Mr. Ion Hamilton, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Rodwell, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Salt, and Mr. Whitelaw
And, on *Mar* 23, Sir Edward Colebrooke and Sir William Cuninghame *added*
Order for Committee discharged, after short debate *May* 18, [229] 998; Bill re-committed [Bill 120]
Committee * (*on re-comm*); Report *June* 8
Considered * *June* 9 [Bill 175]
Read 3° * *June* 16
Lords Amendts. [Bill 274]
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stewart of Garlies*) *June* 19
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 124)
Committee *; Report *July* 13
Committee * *July* 20 (No. 172)
Report * *July* 24
Read 3ª * *July* 25
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 49]

Burglary and Forgery Bill

(*Mr. Forsyth, Lord Francis Hervey, Mr. Locke, Mr. Serjeant Simon*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 11 [Bill 63]
2R. [Dropped]

Burial Grounds Bill

(*Mr. John Talbot, Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 67]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 26, [230] 1913

[*cont.*

Burial Grounds Bill—cont.
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day two months" (*Mr. Osborne Morgan*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir William Edmonstone*); Motion withdrawn
Question again proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Amendt. and original Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Burial, Law of

Moved to resolve "That it is desirable that the law relating to the burial of the dead in England should be amended,
"(1.) By giving facilities for the interment of deceased persons without the use of the burial service of the Church of England in churchyards in which they have a right of interment, if the relatives or friends having the charge of their funerals shall so desire;
"(2.) By enabling the relatives or friends having charge of the funeral of any deceased person to conduct such funeral in any churchyard in which the deceased had a right of interment with such Christian and orderly religious observances as to them may seem fit" (*Earl Granville*) *May* 15, [229] 588; after long debate, on Question? Cont. 92, Not-Cont. 148; M. 56; resolved in the negative
Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont., 664

Burial Services in Parish Churchyards

Petitions presented (*The Archbishop of Canterbury*) *Feb* 29, [227] 1105
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "the parish churchyards of England and Wales having been by the common law of England appropriated to the use of the entire body of the parishioners, it is just and right, while making proper provision for the maintenance of order and decency, to permit interments in such churchyards either without any burial services or with burial services other than those of the Church of England, and performed by persons other than the Ministers of that Church" (*Mr. Osborne Morgan*) v., 1296; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 279, N. 248; M. 31
Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1397

Burials in Churchyards Bill [H.L.]

(*The Earl Grey*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 9 (No. 77)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 23, [229] 1084
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day six months") (*The Lord President*); on Question, that ("now,") &c.; resolved in the negative; and Bill to be read 2ª this day six months

BURT, Mr. T., *Morpeth*

Criminal Law — Buxton Reformatory, [227] 1866
Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1516
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1464

[*cont.*

Burt, Mr. T.—*cont.*
- Elementary Education, 3R. [231] 586
- Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1179
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. [228] 531 ; *add. cl.* [229] 226
- Supply—Report, [227] 996

Butler-Johnstone, Mr. H. A., *Canterbury*
- Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 128
- Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 107
  - Order—Balloting for Motions, [230] 13
- Turkey—Montenegro, [229] 106

Butt, Mr. I., *Limerick City*
- Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 6, [231] 768
- Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 747
- Burial Grounds, 2R. Withdrawal of Bill, [230] 1918
- Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1037 ; *cl.* 4, [229] 182 ; *cl.* 5, [230] 1677
- Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 449, 454
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Consid. *cl.* 1, [231] 978, 979
- Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1051
- Crossed Cheques, Re-comm. *cl.* 12, [231] 1219, 1220 ; Amendt. 1221
- Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [231] 1150
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [229] 1377
- Election Petitions, Trial of, [229] 37
- Expiring Laws (Continuance), Consid. Amendt. [231] 879
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Inspectors of Fisheries—Bye-Laws, [231] 1201
  - Labourers Dwellings, [231] 1197
  - Magistrates—Orange Meeting, Speech at, [229] 172
  - Public Health—Dublin, [228] 1179
- Ireland—An Irish Parliament, [229] 49 ; Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 738, 802, 803
- Ireland—Common Pleas—Resignation of Chief Justice, Motion for a Paper, [231] 1231
- Ireland—Local Taxation, Select Committee on—Valuation, [231] 1078
- Ireland—Peace Preservation Act, Res. [228] 1246
- Ireland—Phœnix Park (Dublin)—Whitefield Lodge, [231] 973, 1072, 1200 ; Motion for Papers, 1222
- Irish Land Act—Notices to Quit, [227] 1294
- Juries (Dublin), Leave, [231] 664
- Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [230] 141 ; 3R. 340
- Land Tenure (Ireland), [227] 817 ; 2R. [228] 771, 814, 819, 1559 ; [230] 666, 710
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 905
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1174, 1183
- Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. [227] 469, 928 ; Consid. *cl.* 4, [231] 663 ; *cl.* 12, *ib.*
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Privilege—Monastic and Conventual Institutions, [228] 1319
  - Public Business, [227] 1125

[*cont.*

Butt, Mr. I.—*cont.*
  - Relevancy of Debate—Appropriation Bill, [231] 1160
  - Strangers, Exclusion of—Sessional Order, [229] 1495
- Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 499
- Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, Res. Amendt. [231] 704, 711
- Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 426
- Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 417
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1319
  - Civil Service Commission, [227] 514, 515
  - Civil Service (Further Vote on Account), Motion for reporting Progress, [230] 822
  - Fishery Board in Scotland, [227] 993
  - Revenue Departments, [228] 1878
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. Amendt. [230] 342, 364, 365
- University Education (Ireland), Leave, [229] 805

Cadogan, Earl
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Church Attendance of Soldiers—Payment for Sittings, [227] 1794
  - Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1112 ; [229] 916
  - Martini-Henry Rifle, [227] 667, 673
  - Militia, Paymasters in the, [230] 848
  - Mobilization, [231] 232
  - Reserve Forces—Yeomanry Trumpeters, [229] 1255
- Army—The Reserves, Motion for Papers, [231] 686
- Malta, Fortifications of, [230] 489

Cairns, Lord (*see* Chancellor, The Lord)

Callan, Mr. P., *Dundalk*
- Army—Aldershot, Insubordination at—St. Patrick's Day, [228] 470
  - Roberts, Captain—94th Regiment, [231] 418
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1398, 1399
- Criminal Law—Bravo, Mr.—The Inquest, [229] 923
  - Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1043
- Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 788
- Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 527
- Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1215
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Criminal Law—Claffey, Trial of, [231] 974 ;—Kirwan, The Convict, [231] 424
  - Dublin, Corporation of, [231] 1230
  - Equity Courts—Lord Justice Christian, [227] 1871, 2017
  - Landed Estates Court—Second Judge, Appointment of, [228] 76
  - Law and Justice—Mr. Serjeant Armstrong, [230] 1140, 1141, 1175
  - Peace Preservation Acts—County of Louth, [230] 1627 ;—Proclaimed Districts, [228] 271
  - Phœnix Park, Dublin, [231] 974
- Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [228] 741

[*cont.*

CALLAN, Mr. P.—*cont.*
Ireland—Common Pleas—Resignation of Chief Justice, Motion for a Paper, [231] 1233, 1234
Ireland—Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 300, 301
Ireland—Public Houses—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 545
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker), Res. [229] 1442
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 6, [228] 1161
Monastic and Conventual Institutions, Petition, [229] 846
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 589
  Privilege—Irregular Petitions, [228] 1319, 1320, 1395, 1399, 1557, 1558;—Public Petitions, Personal Explanation, [229] 586
  Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1637, 1638
  Strangers, Exclusion of, [230] 1554, 1555
Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 330
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1370; Comm. [231] 360
Turkey—Eastern Question, The, [230] 874
United States—Emma Mine, [229] 1352, 1353

CAMBRIDGE, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1115
  Martini-Henry Rifle, [227] 670
Dover Harbour, Petition, [229] 1107
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, Traffic at, [227] 550

CAMERON, Dr. C., *Glasgow*
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] *183, 197, 202, 205, 214, 222
Burgesses (Scotland), Comm. [227] 1779
Civil Service Inquiry Commission—The Customs, [230] 499
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, [227] 1796; Res. [229] 1276, 1284
Education—Government Inspectors and Secondary Schools, [230] 1396
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1164
Fenian Convicts, Escape of, [229] 1604
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1011
Merchant Shipping Acts—Board of Trade Surveys—"Mount Royal," [227] 1566
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," [230] 870
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 375, 394, 395, 396, 397, 425, 1406; Res. Amendt. [231] 746, 749, 753
Post Office—Postal Telegraph Department, Res. [228] 207
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), 2R. [227] 328; Comm. *cl.* 4, [228] 1810; *cl.* 5, *ib.*, 1811; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1813; *cl.* 11, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1814; *add. cl. ib.*
Public Health Act, 1872—Medical Officers of Health, [231] 419
Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 1659
  Local Government Board, &c. [227] 519

CAMERON, Mr. D., *Inverness-shire*
Poor Law (Scotland), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 535

CAMPBELL, Lord
Felstead School—The Rev. W. Grignon, Dismissal of, [228] 1746, 1756
Roumania, Commercial Treaty with, [231] 1192
Turkey—Berlin Memorandum, [230] 395, 418
Turkey—Treaties of 1856, Res. [231] 74, 111

CAMPBELL, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Army Recruiting, [229] 1630
  India—European Regiments, Service of, [231] 120
  Indian and Home Services, [227] 397
  Reserve, The, [227] 1206
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 966
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1461
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 221
Barbadoes—Riots, [229] 43;—Governor Hennessy, 163
Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 121, 123, 124, 132
China—Margary, Mr., Murder of—Report of Mission, [229] 1971
China, Res. [230] 559
Commercial Frauds, [231] 422
Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [227] 1281
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1219
East India Army—Superannuation, &c. Allowances, [227] 1706
East India (Chief Justices of High Courts), 2R. [229] 1153
East India—Christianity, Address for Papers, [227] 237
Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
  Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Report, [228] 699;—Mr. Rivers Wilson, [229] 365
  National Bank of, [227] 1707
Egypt—Mr. Cave's Mission, Res. [231] 615
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1902, 1904
Firman on Reforms, Sublime Porte—Andrassy Note, Address for Papers, [227] 1405
India—Miscellaneous Questions
  Indian Finance—New Loan, [229] 43
  Legislative Council, Acts of the, [230] 426
  Malay Peninsula—Disturbances in the—Papers, [227] 257;—Birch, Mr., Murder of, [229] 1296;—Salangore, British Resident in, 1516
India—Bengal Famine, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1847, 1854
Indian Legislation, 2R. [227] 467
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), 3R. [230] 342
Market—Bubble Companies—Fraudulent Practices, &c. [227] 810, 811
Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [229] 2021
Parliament—Public Business, [229] 1356, 2015, 2017
Prisons, 2R. [230] 286

[*cont.*

CAMPBELL, Sir G.—*cont.*
- Public Works Loans, Comm. [230] 980
- Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 417, 423; 2R. 1730, 1738, 1749; Comm. [228] 92, 110, 159; *cl.* 1, 298, 305, 336
- Saint Vincent (Treatment of Coolies), Motion for an Address, [227] 2074
- Slave Trade (East Africa), Res. [228] 1230
- Supply—Mr. Cave's Mission to Egypt, [231] 655
  - Report—Suez Canal—Modification of Dues, [228] 1571
  - Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 636
- Turkey—Second Note of the Three Powers—The Despatch, [229] 1510

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Mr. H., *Stirling, &c.*
- Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [229] 1711
- Army—Army Recruiting, [229] 1635
  - Guards, Brigade of, Special Allowances to the, [229] 1992
- Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 960
- Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1751; Comm. 1781; Consid. 2023
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1270
- Burgesses (Scotland), Comm. [227] 1779
- Burghs (Division into Wards) (Scotland) Amendment, 3R. [229] 1783
- Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland), 2R. [228] 1162
- Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 259

CAMPERDOWN, Earl of
- Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Motion for Returns, [229] 1261, 1342, 1344; [230] 1, 4
- Gaslight and Coke Company, 2R. [230] 227, 233; Report, 1128, 1130; Comm. 1943; Amendt. 1944, 1950; 3R. Amendt. [231] 367
- Gaslight and Coke Company, South Metropolitan Gas Company, Motion for Returns, [230] 611, 612
- Navy—Flag Rank, Promotion to, [229] 1257, 1258
- Parliamentary Agency, [231] 4
- Turkey—Servian Army, Russian Officers in the, [230] 823
- University of Oxford, 2R. [227] 1692, 1693; Comm. *cl.* 4, [228] 936; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1303; *cl.* 19, 1308; Report, *cl.* 16, 1950; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1952

Canada, Dominion of
- *British Columbia—Canadian Pacific Railway,* Questions, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 3, [230] 870
- *Prince Edward Island—The Land Purchase Act,* 1875, Question, Sir Graham Montgomery; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 21, [227] 559
- *The Treaty of Washington,* Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 7, [228] 1407

CANTERBURY, Archbishop of
- Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 616
- Churchyards—Burial Laws, [227] 1105
- Confession, Motion for a Paper, [230] 1685
- Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [227] 1191, 1199
- Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 791; Comm. *add. cl.* 946
- Fiji, Address for Papers, [230] 1688, 1694
- Intemperance, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 715
- Sulphurous Acid, &c., Address for a Royal Commission, [228] 604
- Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 761
- University of Oxford, 1R. [227] 803; 2R. 1666, 1667; Comm. *cl.* 10, [228] 938; *cl.* 14, 944; *cl.* 15, 948; *cl.* 16, 1303; Amendt. 1304; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1309

CARDWELL, Viscount
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1113
  - Martini-Henry Rifle, [227] 671
  - Mobilization, [231] 234
- Army—The Reserves, Motion for Papers, [231] 683
- Barbadoes, [231] 247, 249
- Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [229] 1033, 1340; Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 108, 114; Amendt. 118; *cl.* 5, 126
- Fiji, Address for Papers, [230] 1693
- Fugitive Slaves — The Circulars — Petition, [227] 1506
- Gaslight and Coke Company, Comm. [230] 1948; 3R. [231] 370
- Mauritius, Coolie Trade in the — The Royal Commission, [229] 480
- Merchant Shipping, 2R. [230] 333
- Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 761
- University of Oxford, Comm. [228] 931; *cl.* 12, 940; *cl.* 14, 946; *cl.* 16, 1305; *cl.* 24, 1310
- West Coast of Africa—Dahomey, King of, [229] 769

CARLINGFORD, Lord
- Dover Harbour, Petition, [229] 1108
- Gaslight and Coke Company, 2R. [230] 232; Comm. 1950
- Irish Peerage, 2R. [228] 1171; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1898; *cl.* 3, 1904
- Merchant Shipping, 2R. [230] 323; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1130; *cl.* 21, 1132
- National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, [229] 361
- Notices to Quit (Ireland), 2R. [230] 1696
- Sea Insurances (Stamping of Policies), 2R. [228] 690
- University of Oxford, 2R. [227] 1674; Comm. *cl.* 4, [228] 935; *cl.* 16, 960, 1303, 1305; *add. cl.* 1316

CARLISLE, Bishop of
- Intemperance, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 721

CARNARVON, Earl of (Secretary of State for the Colonies)
- Africa—West Coast of—Exchange of Territory, [227] 374

[*cont.*

CARNARVON, Earl of—*cont.*
- Barbadoes, Island of—Reported Disturbances, [228] 1819 ; [231] 3, 236, 249
- Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [229] 1001 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [230] 107 ; *cl.* 3, 108, 115, 118, 120, 121 ; *cl.* 4, 124 ; *cl.* 5, 125, 126 ; *cl.* 11, *ib* ; Amendt. 127
- Fiji, Address for Papers, [230] 1689, 1691, 1694
- Gold Coast—Whydah, The Outrage at, [228] 556
- Heligoland, Address for Papers, [227] 1853, 1855
- H.R.H. The Prince of Wales — Nobility of Malta, [229] 363, 1965
- India—Indian Tariff, [227] 2002
- Malay Peninsula, Address for Papers, [227] 1011, 1013 ; Personal Explanation, 1284
- Malay Peninsula, Res. [230] 836
- Mauritius, Coolie Trade in the—The Royal Commission, [229] 477, 480
- Merchant Shipping, 2R. [230] 329
- Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 21
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 1086
- Saint Vincent, Tobago, and Grenada Constitution, 2R. [230] 1039
- University of Oxford, 2R. [227] 1681 ; Comm. [228] 932 ; *cl.* 12, 939
- West African Settlements—Cession of the Gambia, [228] 264
- West Coast of Africa—Dahomey, King of, [229] 766

CARTWRIGHT, Mr. W. C., *Oxfordshire*
- Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1569
- Egypt—Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Report, [228] 480 ; [229] 490
  - Mr. Rivers Wilson, [229] 1112
  - National Bank of, [227] 1417
- England and Portugal, Commercial Relations between, [228] 67
- Fine Arts, Motion for an Address, [229] 282 ; Amendt. 284
- Parliament—Public Petitions from Foreign Towns — Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1419

Cattle Disease (Ireland) Bill

(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 2 [Bill 94]
227] Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 9, 1778
Committee *—R.P. *Mar* 10
228] Committee—R.P. *Mar* 31, 1036
. Committee—R.P. *April* 7, 1471
229] Committee—R.P. *May* 5, 182
230] Committee ; Report *July* 20, 1677
Considered * *July* 25
Considered * *July* 26
. Considered *July* 27, 2021
Read 3° * *July* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *July* 31 (No. 195)
231] Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 7, 666
Committee * ; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 51]

Cattle Disease (Ireland)—Pleuro-Pneumonia—Compulsory Slaughter
- Question, Captain Moore ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 22, [230] 253

Cattle Diseases (England and Ireland)—The Privy Council Regulations
- Question, Observations, The Marquess of Huntly ; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon ; short debate thereon *Feb* 10, [227] 124

CAVE, Right Hon. S. (Paymaster General), *New Shoreham*
- Army—Military Prisoners—Gunner Charlton, [230] 1963
- Civil Departments (Employment of Soldiers), Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1996
- Egypt—Mr. Cave's Mission, Res. [231] 619, 653
- Egyptian Debt — Mr. Cave's Report, [229] 490 ;—The Decree, 776

CAVE, Mr. T., *Barnstaple*
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 233
- Royal Titles, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 156

CAVENDISH, Lord F. C., *Yorkshire, W.R., N. Div.*
- Barbadoes—Riots, The—Governor Hennessy, [229] 152
- Church of England—Halifax, Vicarage of, [230] 1177

229] Elementary Education, Leave, 961 ; 2R. 1919
230] Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1293 ; Amendt. 1294,
. 1296 ; *cl.* 6, 1403, 1409 ; *cl.* 7, 1416 ;
. *cl.* 11, 1443, 1449 ; *cl.* 14, 1455 ; *cl.* 16,
. 1496 ; *cl.* 20, 1499 ; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1508,
. 1509 ; *cl.* 34, 1512 ; *add. cl.* 1537 ; Amendt.
. 1540, 1544, 1666, 1910, 2006
231] 10, 25 ; Schedule 1, Amendt. 68 ; Consid.
. *cl.* 8, Amendt. 474, 475 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. *ib.*,
. 479 ; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 554 ; *cl.* 18, Amendt.
. 555

- Halifax, Vicar's Rate at, [229] 1520
- Henwood, Mr. Charles, Petition of, Res. [228] 344
- Legal Departments Commission, 1874, Report, [227] 1837
- Parliament, Acts of—Report of Select Committee, Res. [228] 576
- Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1878
- Saint Vincent (Treatment of Coolies), Motion for an Address, [227] 2075
- Supply—Royal Palaces, [228] 251
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 357
- Telegraphs (Money), 2R. [227] 1490

CAWLEY, Mr. C. E., *Salford*
- Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [230] 857
- Oyster Fisheries, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [227] 1499
- Rivers, Pollution of, [229] 671

Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G. (Surveyor General of Ordnance), *Essex, W.*

- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Barracks, Accommodation in, [227] 1767
  - Dublin, Garrison of—Typhoid Fever, [227] 2015
  - Grocery Rations, Issue of, [228] 626
  - Guards, The—Stock-Purse Fund Allowances, [228] 1627
  - Moncrieff System of Artillery, [230] 420; [231] 419
  - Patented Inventions—Small Arms, [230] 1479
- Army Estimates—Warlike and other Stores, [229] 1640, 1647
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1654
- Irish Militia Regiments, [228] 1627
- National Rifle Association — Martini-Henry Rifles, [228] 561
- Woolwich Arsenal, [228] 1459

Ceylon—The Breakwater at Trincomalee

- Observation, General Sir George Balfour; Reply, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 6, [230] 1049

Chadwick, Mr. D., *Macclesfield*

- Parliament—Business of the House—Opposed Business, Res. [227] 186
- Unreformed Municipal Corporations (England and Wales), Res. [227] 1159
- Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1941
- Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1352

Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)

- *c.* Motion for Leave (*The Solicitor General for Ireland*) *August* 5, [231] 664; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 286]
  - Read 2°* *August* 9
  - Committee*; Report *August* 10
  - Considered*; read 3° *August* 11
- *l.* Read 1ᵃ* (*Lord President*) *August* 12 (No. 235)
  - Read 2ᵃ*; Committee negatived; read 3ᵃ *August* 14
  - Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 71]

Chamberlain, Mr. J., *Birmingham*

- Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 538

Chambers, Sir T., *Marylebone*

- Civil Service Trading, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 178
- Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1933
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, [228] 352
- Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 970
- Prisons, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 933
- Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1736

Chancellor, The Lord (Lord Cairns)

- Appellate Jurisdiction, 1R. [227] 203; 2R. 924; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1287; *cl.* 15, 1291; Commons Amendts. [231] 946, 948, 958, 959, 960
- Bankers Books Evidence, 2R. [230] 1471
- Bankruptcy, 1R. [229] 1496; 2R. [230] 235; Comm. 610
- Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 615
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [230] 1428, 1430; *cl.* 21, 1431; *cl.* 30, 1432
- Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment, 2R. [231] 1065, 1066, 1067
- Criminal Law—Untried Prisoners, Detention of—Case of George Hill, [228] 920
- Crossed Cheques, 1R. [227] 474; 2R. 1106
- Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 119, 122
- Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [227] 1198
- Forfeiture Relief, 2R. [231] 963
- Fugitive Slaves — The Circulars — Petition, [227] 1512, 1545, 1562; Personal Explanation, 1660
- Gaslight and Coke Company, Comm. [230] 1949
- General School of Law, 2R. [228] 1893
- Grand Juries (Ireland), Res. [229] 1413
- India—Indian Tariff, [227] 1990, 1994
- Inns of Court, 2R. [228] 1893; Comm. [229] 587
- Irish Church Act—Irish National Monuments, [230] 1766, 1767
- Irish Peerage, 2R. [228] 1169; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1895, 1896; Report, [229] 197
- Judicature Act (1873)—Court of Appeal, [229] 1269
  - Home Circuit, Abolition of, [227] 475
- Judicature Acts—Cave v. Mackenzie, [230] 1953
- Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Report, [230] 1619
- Marriage Law, Amendment of the, [228] 611
- Merchant Shipping, 2R. [230] 333; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1131
- Metropolitan Gas, Report, [230] 1129
- Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. [231] 937
- Notices to Quit (Ireland), 2R. [230] 1696
- Parliament—Lords, Roll of the, [227] 201
  - Prorogation of — Queen's Speech, [231] 1224, 1225, 1229, 1234
  - Queen's Speech, [227] 2
- Parliamentary Agency, Report of Select Committee, [230] 1767, 1768; [231] 4
- Patent Laws Amendment, 1R. [227] 663
- Patents for Inventions, 2R. [227] 1944
- Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 874; Comm. 1048, 1057, 1094; *cl.* 1, 1095, 1301; 3R. 1387, 1390, 1392, 1967, 1975
- Slave Trade, Comm. [230] 850
- Sulphurous Acid, &c., Address for a Royal Commission, [228] 609
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 1R. [228] 46, 56; 2R. 1302; Report, *cl.* 18, Amendt. [229] 763; *cl.* 78, Amendt. *ib.*
- Trustees, Responsibility of, [228] 1176
- Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 760
- United States—Extradition, Address for Correspondence, [230] 1807; [231] 371
- University of Oxford, Comm. [228] 821; *cl.* 4, 935; *cl.* 14, 945; *cl.* 16, 1306, 1307; *cl.* 19, 1309; *cl.* 24, 1310; *cl.* 25, 1313, 1314
- Winter Assizes, 2R. [231] 225

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Right Hon. Sir S. H. NORTHCOTE), *Devon, N.*
  Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland), Lords Amendts. [230] 1272
  Agricultural Holdings (England) Act—Stamps, [228] 63
  Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1127
  Appropriation Act, [231] 967
  Army and Navy Expenditure, 1874-5, Comm. [231] 660
  Army and Navy Expenditure Accounts, Audit of, [229] 2008
  Bankers Books Evidence, 2R. [229] 1598
  Bankers Deposits—Financial Panics, Res. [229] 791
  Bank of England — Loans Act—Suez Canal Shares, [228] 270, 351
  Banks of Issue—Committee, Re-appointment of, [227] 555 ; [228] 353
  Births and Deaths, Registration — Medical Certificates, [228] 71, 1326
  British Museum —Salaries, [230] 858
  Brussels International Exhibition, [230] 1886
  Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1920
  China, Res. [230] 569
  Civil Service—Miscellaneous Questions
    Clerks, Higher Division of, [227] 554 ;—Lower Division of, 678 ; [228] 473
    Order in Council—Clause 12, [228] 1759
    Writers at the Customs Out-Ports, [228] 963
  Civil Service Inquiry Commission—The Customs, [230] 499 ; Report, [227] 134, 484
  Commons, Comm. [229] 1251, 1252, 1536
  Consolidated Fund (£4,080,000), 3R. [227] 1437 ; [228] 565
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Consid. *cl.* 4, [231] 981
  Constabulary Pensioners (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 571
  Criminal Law—Joseph Hadley, Case of, [228] 627
  Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1516 ; Re-comm. *cl.* 12, [231] 1221
  Customs Acts, Consolidation of, [228] 1579
  Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1578
229] Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. 745 ;
. Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 965, 981,
. 987 ; *cl.* 2, 1198 ; *cl.* 3, *ib.* ; *cl.* 6, 1200 ;
. *cl.* 8, 1206, 1210, 1212 ; *cl.* 9, 1213, 1214 ;
. *add. cl. ib.*, 1215, 1218 ; 3R. 1370
  Dover Harbour, [229] 1346 ; [231] 692
  Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
    Cave, Mr., Mission of—Suez Canal Shares, Purchase of, [227] 226, 227 ;— Commissions, 1120
    Egyptian Finance—Decrees of May 2, [229] 918
    Mr. Cave's Report, [228] 74, 622, 700, 1038 ; [230] 11
    Mr. Rivers Wilson, [228] 1325 ; [229] 365, 1112
    Suez Canal, [227] 2011 ;—Administration, —The Surtax, [228] 1326 ;—Dues, Convention as to, 684, 685, 812 ;—English Representatives, 562 ;—Payment of the Interest, [229] 1521 ; — Representation and Management, 39, 40, 173, 175, 181 1604, 1605 ;—Shares, 1417

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
    Suez Canal Company—Concession and Firman, [227] 138 ;— Statutes and Bye-Laws, 229, 265
  Egypt—Mr. Cave's Mission, Res. [231] 629 ; Explanation, 877
230] Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 11, 1420,
. 1446 ; *cl.* 16, 1497 ; Amendt. *ib.* ; *add. cl.*
. 1543, 1551, 1661, 1844, 1875, 1896, 1905,
. 1909, 1910, 1994, 2018
231] 18 ; Consid. *cl.* 14, 478, 489, 493, 494, 495,
. 525, 534, 550
  Exchequer Bonds, Comm. *cl.* 2, [227] 1401, 1402 ; *cl.* 4, 1403 ; 3R. 1420, 1434, 1437
  Expiring Laws Continuance, Consid. [231] 879
  Factory and Workshops, Report on, [231] 550
  Friendly Societies Act—Registration Clause, [229] 103
  Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment, 2R. [229] 1597
  Harbours of Refuge—Dover, [231] 973 ;—North East Coast, [230] 1973
  Henwood, Mr. Charles, Petition of, Res. [228] 344
  H.R.H. The Prince of Wales—Visit to India—Expenditure, [231] 1077
  House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 552, 554 ; [229] 1598
  India—Duties on Manufactures, [229] 36
    War Office Charges, [231] 118
  Indian and Colonial Museum, [230] 257
  International Congress of Hygienie, Brussels, [228] 1483
  Irish Land Act—Notices to Quit, [227] 1294
  Judicature Act, 1873—Official Referees, [229] 1419
  Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), [229] 1275
  Local Finance, [227] 1122
  Local Light Dues (Reduction), Comm. [229] 1963
  Local Taxation — Amount and Distribution, [229] 669
  Maritime Contracts, Leave, [227] 142, 159, 162 ; [229] 43
228] Merchant Shipping, Comm. 537 ; *cl.* 3, 551,
. 682, 903, 909 ; *cl.* 5, 1157 ; *cl.* 6, 1160, 1161 ;
. *cl.* 14, 1374, 1376, 1377, 1588 ; *cl.* 15, 1597,
. 1607, 1613, 1616, 1617, 1620 ; *cl.* 16, Amendt.
. 1779, 1791, 1796, 1801, 1803 ; *cl.* 27, 1917 ;
. *add. cl.* 1930, 1938, 1940, 1943, 1945, 1946,
. 1947, 1949
229] 59, 78, 79, 95 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1060 ;
. *cl.* 11, 1069, 1070 ; *cl.* 18, 1074, 1076 ; *cl.* 20,
. 1078, 1079 ; 3R. 1337
231] Lords' Amendts. 1172, 1179, 1181, 1184
  Merchant Shipping Act—Light Dues, [229] 1972
  Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [231] 1199
  Metropolitan Board of Works—Finance, [231] 1205
  Monastic and Conventual Institutions, Petition, [229] 847
  Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. [227] 1942
  Parliament — Debate, Relevancy of — Appropriation Bill, [231] 1161
    Derby Day, [229] 1275
    Public Business, Arrangement of, [228] 1762 ; [229] 491, 492, 1196, 1276 ; [230] 365, 1912 ; [231] 551
    Reporting, [231] 1198

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [231] 709, 710, 711
Parliament—Private Bills—Canvassing in the House, Res. [227] 1495
Parliament—Referees on Private Bills, Nomination of Select Committee, [227] 1496, 1497
Parliament — Strangers, Presence of, Res. Amendt. [229] 1819
Peru — Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 421, 427
Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1676
Poor Law (Scotland)—Medical Relief, [228] 1483
Post Office—Telegraph Service, [227] 1207
Post Office — Postal Telegraph Department, Res. [228] 224
Prisons, 2R. [230] 312, 930
Public Houses (Ireland) — Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 567, 920, 1275
Public Works Loan Commissioners — Road Trusts (Scotland), [230] 872
Public Works Loans, Comm. [230] 975, 981
Railway Accident—John Chiddy, Reward to, [231] 713
Royal Titles, 2R. [227] 1746, 1749; Comm. [228] 86, 92, 97; *cl.* 1, 314, 335
Royal Titles—The Proclamation, [228] 1771, 1773, 1982
Savings Banks and Friendly Societies—Deficiencies, [228] 272
Sea Insurances (Stamping of Policies), 2R. [227] 1187
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 839, 840, 845, 856; *cl.* 1, *ib.*
Supply—Army Purchase Commission, [228] 1879
  Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [227] 1849; [229] 1309, 1332
  Civil Service Commission, [227] 507, 509, 511, 512, 513, 1100
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1469
  Local Government Board, &c. [227] 518, 519
  Mint, including Coinage, [227] 522, 523, 525
  Public Buildings, [229] 1586
  Report, [229] 1757
  Report—Suez Canal—Modification of Dues, [228] 1566
  Royal Palaces, [228] 251
  Suez Canal Shares, [227] 266, 297; Res. 607, 616
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873 — Official Referees, [229] 774
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 365
Trade Union Act, 1871, [227] 678
Tralee Savings Bank, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1584
Treaties Respecting Non-European Countries—Hertslet's "Map of Europe by Treaty," [231] 416
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [231] 876
  Guaranteed Loan of 1855, [227] 398; [231] 423
  Insurgent Provinces, [230] 500
  Loans of 1854 and 1855, [228] 698; [231] 1203
  Loans of 1854 and 1871, [231] 966
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1746, 1748, 1760
United States—"Alabama" Award, [229] 928
  Extradition Treaty, [230] 500
University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1748
Valuation—Surveyors of Taxes, [228] 1760
Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. [227] 1162; Bill withdrawn, [230] 1941
Ways and Means—Miscellaneous Questions
  Income Tax — Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1875, [229] 668
  Inland Revenue Department, [227] 556; [231] 695;—Extra Pay, [230] 1390
  Inland Revenue—Armorial Bearings, [230] 1391;—Friendly and Building Societies—Fees on Certificates, [228] 1097;—Game Licences, [229] 1419;—Malt Tax, [229] 1973;—(Out-door Department)—Playfair Commission, [229] 1973;—Railway Passenger Duty, [227] 1020; [230] 1475;—London, Chatham, and Dover, &c. Railways, [231] 1075;—Servants, Taxes on Casual, [227] 400
  Out-Door Excise Establishment, [230] 422
  Stamp Act—Marine Policies—"Sassoon v. Harris," [227] 679
  Treasury Minute, [230] 858
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1100, 1127, 1144, 1324
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1357, 1362, 1365, 1366
Ways and Means—Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whisky, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1210
Ways and Means—Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1591, 1602
Ways and Means, Comm. [229] 1082

Channel Islands—Royal Court of Jersey
Questions, Mr. Locke; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 29, [227] 1120; *Mar* 20, [228] 351; *Mar* 31, 964; *August* 10, [231] 968
Orders in Council, Questions, Mr. Locke; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 17, [230] 5; *June* 26, 428; *July* 20, 1622

Channel Tunnel Scheme
Question, Mr. Bromley-Davenport; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 12, [229] 1665;—*English Channel, The—The Straits Tunnel*, Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 4, [230] 947
  Report of the Commissioners . . [1576]

CHAPLIN, Colonel E., *Lincoln*
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 15, [228] 1591

CHAPLIN, Mr. H., *Lincolnshire, Mid*
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 34, [230] 1512
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [230] 226

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Chaplin, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [227] 471
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 124
Turkey—Eastern Question, The, [230] 255
Wild Fowl Preservation, Comm. [229] 1661
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1719

Charley, Mr. W. T., *Salford*
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [229] 1706 ; Comm. [230] 1151 ; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1160 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. [231] 773 ; Consid. Amendt. 859, 868 ; *add. cl.* 873 ; Amendt. 880 ; *cl.* 13, 882
Barbadoes—Riots, The—Governor Hennessy, [229] 144, 151
China, Res. [230] 565
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 26, [230] 1503 ; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1546 ; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 548, 552
Elementary Education Act, 1870—Armley National School, [230] 1527
Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London), Comm. [231] 1189
London Municipal Government, Res. [229] 1818
Offences against the Person, 2R. [227] 138 ; Comm. 332, 335, 1189 ; [228] 1622, 1623
Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 326, 329
Public Health—Dairy Farms, Supervision of, [231] 1199
Eagley, Typhoid Fever at, [227] 552 ; [231] 421

Chelmsford, Lord
Marriage Law, Amendment of the, [228] 609

Chelsea Hospital Accounts Bill
(*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Stanley*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *April* 26 [Bill 133]
Read 2°* *May* 4
Committee* ; Report *May* 8
Read 3°* *May* 9
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl Cadogan*) *May* 11 (No. 81)
Read 2ª* *May* 16
Committee* ; Report *May* 18
Read 3ª* *May* 22
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 14]

Cheques on Bankers Bill
(*Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Twells*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. J. G. Hubbard*) *Feb* 15, [227] 315 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* [Bill 70]
2R. [Dropped]

Childers, Right Hon. H. C. E., *Pontefract*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Consid. *cl.* 4, [231] 981
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] *684, 704, 705 ; Comm. 948
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Res. [229] 1284
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 1374 ; *cl.* 16, 1796 ; 3R. [229] 1334

Childers, Right Hon. H. C. E.—*cont.*
Navy—Royal Marines, [228] 1520
Navy—Navigation of Her Majesty's Ships, Res. [228] 1656
Navy—Ships of War, Res. [229] 255
Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [228] 1552, 1554
Coast Guard Services, [229] 255
Dockyards, &c. [230] 465, 471
Scientific Departments, [230] 460
Seamen and Marines, [228] 1544
Parliament—Public Business, [228] 1762
Prisons, 2R. [230] 926, 929
Public Works Loans, Comm. [230] 979
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 406, 407
Science and Art—Transit of Venus, [230] 1169
Turkey — Salonica Murders — Correspondence, [230] 1820
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1366

China
Chinese Consul at Hong Kong, Question, Mr. Richard ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 31, [231] 119
Murder of Mr. Margary—The Papers, Question, Mr. Richard ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 10, [227] 136 ; Question, Mr. Leatham ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 10, 1798 ;—*Report of the Mission,* Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 16, [229] 1971
Outrage at Hankow, Question, Mr. Puleston ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 4, [229] 44
Port of Kiung Chow, Question, Mr. Pender ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 15, [229] 671
The Blockade Question, Question, Mr. Pender ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 27, [230] 503
The Yunnan Mission, Question, Sir Trevor Lawrence ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 10, [228] 1479 :—*The Report,* Question, Mr. Mark Stewart ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 31, [231] 117

Parl. Papers—
Murder of Mr. Margary . . . [1422]
Yunnan Mission . . . . [1456]

China
Moved, "That, having regard to the unsatisfactory nature of our relations with China, and to the desirability of placing those relations on a permanently satisfactory footing, this House is of opinion that the existing Treaty between the two Countries should be so revised as to promote the interests of Commerce, and to secure the just rights of the Chinese Government and People" (*Mr. Richard*) *June* 27, [230] 536 ; after debate, Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Ritchie*) ; Motion withdrawn ; original Motion withdrawn

Church Bodies (*Gibraltar*)—*The Ordinances*
Question, Mr. Dillwyn ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 11, [227] 225 ; *Feb* 14, 262 ; *Mar* 16, [228] 66 ; *July* 13, [230] 1399

[*cont.*

Church Bodies (*Gibraltar*)—*The Ordinances*—cont.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to withhold her assent to the Draft Ordinances for creating Anglican and Roman Catholic Church Bodies at Gibraltar, which have been recently laid upon the Table of the House" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *Mar* 28, [228] 767; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

The Ordinances—(*Parl. P.* 91)

CHURCHILL, Lord R., *Woodstock*

Metropolis—Hyde Park—Rotten Row, [229] 672

Church of England

Burial Services—The Dore Burial Case, Questions, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 23, [228] 469; *Mar* 31, 966

Episcopal See of Gibraltar, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 12, [231] 1156

Gloucester District Registry, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 18, [229] 925

The Burial Service, Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 30, [228] 881

The Vicarage of Halifax, Question, Lord Frederick Cavendish; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 1, [229] 1520; *July* 10, [230] 1177; Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 10, [231] 972

[See title *Burial, Law of — Resolutions* (*Earl Granville*)]

Church of England, Confession in the— Report of Committee of Convocation

Moved, "That there be laid before this House Copy of Report of the Committee of the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury with regard to confession, agreed to in the Session of 1874" (*The Lord Oranmore and Browne*) *July* 21, [230] 1681; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Church of Scotland (*Election of Ministers*) —See under *Scotland*

Church Rates Abolition (Scotland) Bill

(*Mr. M'Laren, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Grieve, Mr. Laing, Sir George Balfour*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 25]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 15, [228] 8

Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir William Cuninghame*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 155, N. 210; M. 55

Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Churchyards—Owston Churchyard

Question, Mr. Watkin Williams; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 2, [227] 1202

City of London Companies

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Return setting forth in detail a Statement of the real and personal property vested in the City of London Companies respectively; also a detailed Statement of the charities payable by such Companies and of the income derived from all sources; and Statement of expenditure and receipts during the last three years preceding the 1st day of January 1875" (*Mr. James*) *May* 23, [229] 1117; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

Civil Bill Courts (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)

c. Motion for Leave (*The Solicitor General for Ireland*) *Feb* 18, [227] 544; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 82]

2R.; after short debate, Debate adjourned *June* 27, [230] 535

Bill withdrawn * *July* 17

Civil Departments (*Employment of Soldiers*)

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire—

"1st. How far it is practicable that Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines who have meritoriously served their Country should be employed in such Civil Departments of the public service as they may be found fitted for;

"2nd. How far it is practicable, in order to form and retain an efficient Reserve Force, for the State to become the medium of communication between private employers of labour and Soldiers of the Army Reserve and Militia Reserve who desire to obtain employment:

"And that the Committee be directed to report on the best means of carrying these objects into effect" (*Sir Henry Havelock*) *May* 2, [228] 1987; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Select Committee appointed, "to inquire how far it is practicable that Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines who have meritoriously served their Country should be employed in such Civil Departments of the public service as they may be found fitted for" (*Sir Henry Havelock*)

And, on *May* 15, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir George Balfour, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. Childers, Mr. James Corry, Lord Elcho, Mr. Errington, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy, Sir Henry Havelock, Viscount Hinchingbrook, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. John Holms, Mr. Laing, Colonel Mure, Mr. Gerard Noel, Captain Price, Sir Charles Russell, General Shute, Mr. John Talbot; *May* 16, Sir John Hay, Major O'Gorman *added*

Civil Servants Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates) Bill—See title **Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates) Bill**

Civil Service Inquiry Commission
Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 10, [227] 134
Higher Division of Clerks, Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 18, [227] 484; Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 21, 554
Lower Division of Clerks, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 22, [227] 677
The Order in Council—Clause 12—Lower Division of Writers, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 23, [228] 472; Question, Mr. O'Conor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 27, 1759
Writers at the Customs Out-Ports, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 31, [228] 963;—*Out-door Officers at Out-Ports,* Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 10, [228] 1478
Customs (*Out-door Department*), Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 23, [229] 1115
Scheme of the Playfair Commission — The Customs, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 27, [230] 499
Inland Revenue (*Out-door Department*), Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 16, [229] 1973

Civil Service Trading
Motion for a Select Committee (*Sir Thomas Chambers*) *June* 20, [230] 178
[House counted out]

Clean Rivers Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Doncaster*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *July* 17 (No. 182)
Read 2ª *July* 25, [230] 1881
Committee*; Report *July* 27
Read 3ª* *July* 28
c. Read 1°* *July* 31 [Bill 279]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 10

Clerk of the Peace and of the Crown (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 30 [Bill 119]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 26, [229] 1337
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*)
Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Meldon*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn* *July* 17

Cleveland, Duke of
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 19, [230] 1430
University of Oxford, 2R. [227] 1686; Comm. [228] 932; *cl.* 16, 1306; Report, *add. cl.* 1952

Clifford, Mr. C. C., *Newport, Isle of Wight*
University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1737
Unreformed Municipal Corporations — Yarmouth and Brading, Isle of Wight, [229] 1620

Clive, Mr. G., *Hereford*
Army — Dublin, Garrison of—Typhoid Fever, [227] 2015
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), [229] 1274, 1275
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. Amendt [228] 790
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1768
Salmon Fisheries Inspectors' Report — The Wye, [229] 264, 1972

Coal Mines
Accidents in Coal Mines, Question, Mr. Sidebottom; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 22, [227] 674
Mines Act—Use of Blasting Powder—Legislation, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 10, [227] 136; *Feb* 28, 1022; *Mar* 10, 1797
Mines Inspectors Reports for 1875, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 22, [227] 680
The Birley Explosion, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 11, [230] 1279
The Clifton Hall Colliery Accident, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 11, [231] 1074
The Wigan Collieries, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 13, [229] 1760
Reports of Inspectors, 1875 . . [1499]
Further Reports on Blasting Powder . . . . [1449]

Coal—Sale by Weight—Legislation
Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 24, [227] 816

Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland) Bill (*Dr. Ward, Mr. Butt, Mr. Collins, Sir Joseph M'Kenna*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 9]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 22, [228] 428
After debate, Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*), 464; Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 131, N. 215; M. 84
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Cochrane, Mr. A. D. W. R. Baillie, *Isle of Wight*
Arctic Expedition—"Pandora," Officers of the, [229] 1110
Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 107, 123, 143
Fine Arts, Motion for an Address, [229] 288
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1386
Metropolis—Paving, Cleansing, and Lighting, [230] 423
Railway Accident—John Chiddy, Reward to, [231] 714
Supply—Report—Suez Canal—Modification of Dues, [228] 1571
Turkey—Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [231] 730
Unreformed Municipal Corporations — Yarmouth and Brading, Isle of Wight, [229] 1619, 1621

Cogan, Right Hon. W. H. F., *Kildare*
Navy—Sub-Lieutenants, [229] 1186
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 540

Colchester, Lord
University of Oxford, 2R. Amendt. [227] 1661, 1667; Comm. *cl.* 16, [228] 1304; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1307; *add. cl.* 1316; Report, *cl.* 16, 1951

Cole, Mr. H. T., *Penrhyn, &c.*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [230] 1152; *cl.* 3, 1160
Coroners, Res. [230] 1314
Judicature Act, 1873—Summer Assizes, [229] 921, 1187
Magistrates (Ireland)—Orange Meeting, Speech at, [229] 172
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 93; Lords Amendts. Consid. [231] 1178
Prisons, 2R. [230] 310
Unreformed Municipal Corporations (England and Wales), Res. [227] 1160

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire, N.*
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 205
Burghs and Populous Places (Scotland) Gas Supply, 2R. [228] 5; Comm. [229] 999
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), [227] 399
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1630, 1649, 1654
Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 498; Instruction, Res. [228] 617
Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 259; Comm. [230] 533
Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 422; Comm. [228] 109, 110
Supply—Public Education in Scotland, [231] 268

Coleridge, Lord
Appellate Jurisdiction, Commons Amendts. [231] 949
Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 639
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 109
[*cont.*

Coleridge, Lord—*cont.*
Fugitive Slaves — The Circulars, Petition, [227] 1558, 1562
Inns of Court, Comm. [229] 588
Judicature Act, Explanation, [231] 1
Judicature Acts—Cave v. Mackenzie, [230] 1957
United States—Extradition, Address for Correspondence, [230] 1805

Collins, Mr. E., *Kinsale*
Bankers Deposits — Financial Panics, Res. [229] 791
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 740
Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 452
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [227] 463; Comm. *cl.* 9, [228] 1370
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1170
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 356
Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, [227] 1842
  Public Works in Ireland, [227] 1846
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1364

Colman, Mr. J. J., *Norwich*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2055
Elementary Education Act—Wrentham, [227] 1414
Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1605
Norwich and Boston (Corrupt Voters), Comm. [231] 1055

Colonial Marriages Bill
(*Sir Thomas Chambers, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Young*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 24 [Bill 87]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 5

Colville of Culross, Lord
Railway Accidents, Royal Commission on—Brakes, [229] 1095
Wild Fowl Preservation, 3R. [230] 1469

Commercial Frauds—Legislation
Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 3, [231] 422

Commons Bill (*Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *Feb* 10, 227] 186; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 51]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 18, 525
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House considers that the Bill does not provide sufficient facilities for the regulation and improvement of commons in their present open condition, and is of opinion that, after the recent decisions given in regard to Epping Forest and other cases, where inclosures have been illegally and arbitrarily made, no inclosures should be permitted except under the special sanction of Parlia-
[*cont.*

Commons Bill—cont.
ment" (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"
229] *May* 25, 1219
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, this Bill does not give adequate protection to the interests of the rural labourers, and does not provide proper securities against the inclosure of those Commons which it is desirable to preserve in their uninclosed condition for the use and enjoyment of the people" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 234, N. 98; M. 136
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.
. Committee—R.P. *May* 29, 1379
. Committee—R.P. *June* 1, 1523
. Committee; Report *June* 8, 1556 [Bill 184]
230] Considered *June* 20, 131
Read 3° * *June* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 23 (No. 139)
. Read 2ª, after short debate *July* 6, 1029
. Committee *July* 14, 1427
. Report *July* 18, 1518 (No. 176)
Read 3ª * *July* 20 (No. 183)
231] *c.* Lords Amendts considered *August* 7, 773
Amendts. as far as the Amendt. in page 22, line 33, read 2°, and agreed to
Page 22, line 33, after "situate," to insert "but the provisions of this section shall not apply to any commons or waste lands whereon the rights of common are vested solely in the lord of the manor," the next Amendt. read 2°
Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendt.;" A. 47, N. 18; M. 29; subsequent Amendts. agreed to [Bill 273]
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 56]

Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Chadwick, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Benjamin Whitworth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 27 [Bill 211]
Read 2° * *August* 5
Committee *—R.P. *August* 7
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3° * *August* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Fortescue*) *August* 10 (No. 218)
Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 11, [231] 1065

CONOLLY, Mr. T., *Donegal Co.*
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 771, 774, 775
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [228] 1939

Consolidated Fund (£4,080,000) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Resolution [Feb 24] reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 25
Read 2° * *Feb* 28

Consolidated Fund (£4,080,000) *Bill*—cont.
Committee *—R.P. *Mar* 2
Committee *; Report *Mar* 3
Read 3°, after short debate *Mar* 6, [227] 1437
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 6
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 7
Royal Assent *Mar* 9 [39 *Vict.* c. 2]

Consolidated Fund (£10,029,550 5s. 1d.) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Resolutions [March 20] reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 21
Read 2° * *Mar* 22
Committee *; Report *Mar* 23
Read 3°, after short debate *Mar* 24, [228] 563
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 24
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 25
Royal Assent *Mar* 27 [39 *Vict.* c. 4]

Consolidated Fund (£11,000,000) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Considered in Committee *May* 22; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *May* 24
Read 2° * *May* 25
Committee *; Report *May* 26
Read 3° * *May* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 29
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *May* 30
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 15]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *August* 7
231] Read 2° *August* 8, 821
. Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, 966
. Committee; Report, after short debate *August* 10, 978
. Read 3° *August* 11, 1078
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *August* 11
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *August* 12
Read 3ª * *August* 14
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 60]

Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal Bill
(*Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Mr. Whitbread, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 10 [Bill 55]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 19, [230] 1556
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "considering the time which has elapsed since the Report of the Royal Commission, it is desirable that the subject of the Contagious Diseases Acts be referred to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Eustace Smith*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

[cont.

Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal Bill—cont.
Main Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day two months" (*Sir Charles Legard*)
Question put, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 102, N. 224; M. 122
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for two months

Contagious Diseases (Animals)
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the general orders and regulations for the stoppage of Contagious Diseases among Stock should cease to be varying or permissive, and should be uniform throughout Great Britain and Ireland" (*Mr. Clare Read*) *Mar* 14, [227] 2017
Amendt. to add, at end of Question, "and that it is further desirable that the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1873, in relation to foot and mouth disease, should be carried into effect" (*Mr. O'Conor*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill
(*Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Ronayne, Mr. O'Clery*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 5 [Bill 143]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 10

Convicted Children Bill (*Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Serjeant Simon*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 14 [Bill 192]
Read 2°* *June* 28
Bill withdrawn, after short debate *July* 5, [230] 1028

Convict Prisons (Returns) Bill
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 3 [Bill 227]
Read 2°* *July* 10
Committee*; Report *July* 13
Read 3°* *July* 14
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *July* 17
Read 2ª* *July* 27 (No. 179)
Committee*; Report *July* 28
Read 3ª* *July* 31
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 42]

Coolies—The Island of Réunion
Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 23, [228] 478

COOPE, Mr. O. E., *Middlesex*
Army—Militia Storehouses in Middlesex, [229] 1894
Inland Revenue—Public Health Act, 1875—Proxy Stamp, [228] 1410
National Gallery—New Buildings, [228] 170

Copyright Commission
Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 16, [228] 64

CORK, Earl of
Army — Reserve Forces — Yeomanry Trumpeters, [229] 1256

Coroners
Moved, "That further legislation is desirable with regard to the qualification and appointment of Coroners and the mode of holding inquests" (*Lord Francis Hervey*) *July* 11, [230] 1301; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Coroners (Dublin) Bill
(*Mr. Sullivan, Sir Arthur Guinness, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Patrick Martin*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 13 [Bill 104]
Read 2°* *Mar* 27
Committee*; Report *May* 17 [Bill 152]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *May* 24
Committee*; Report *May* 25
Considered* *May* 26
Read 3°* *May* 29
Lords Amendts. [Bill 214]
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord O'Hagan*) *May* 30 (No. 102)
Read 2ª* *June* 22
Committee* *June* 23
Report* *June* 26
Read 3ª* *June* 27
Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 93]

Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill
Afterwards—
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *August* 8 [Bill 291]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 10

CORRY, Hon. H. W. Lowry, *Tyrone*
Army—Omagh, Barracks at, [227] 259

CORRY, Mr. J. P., *Belfast*
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 214

COTTESLOE, Lord
Agricultural Children Act, [227] 131
Gold Coast—Whydah, The Outrage at, [228] 555
Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Report, [230] 1620
Poor Law Amendment, 2R. [230] 1278
Railway Accidents—Royal Commission, Report, [227] 664
West African Settlements—Cession of the Gambia, [228] 264
West Coast of Africa—Dahomey, King of, [229] 764

COTTON, Right Hon. W. J. R. (Lord Mayor), *London*
City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1139
Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [230] 1515; 3R. [231] 1217; Re-comm. *cl.* 4, 1219; *cl.* 12, 1220
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [231] 1150

[*cont.*

Cotton, Right Hon. W. J. R.—*cont.*
India—Kirwee Booty, [230] 1393
Prisons, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 312, 886
Toll Bridges (River Thames), [230] 1628

Council of India (Professional Appointments) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. William Henry Smith*)

c. Resolution [Feb 11] reported, and agreed to: Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 69]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 2, [227] 1278
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is inexpedient to pass this Bill, as it would throw an additional and unnecessary charge on the Revenues of India" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *v.*; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 151, N. 41; M. 110
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *Mar* 6
Read 3° * *Mar* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*M. of Salisbury*) *Mar* 10 (No. 28)
Read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 17, [228] 165
Committee *Mar* 21, 345
Report * *Mar* 23
Read 3ª * *Mar* 24
Royal Assent *April* 7 [39 *Vict.* c. 7]

County Infirmaries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Meldon, Mr. Parnell, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 47]
2R. [Dropped]

County of Peebles Justiciary District (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 28 [Bill 212]
Read 2° * *June* 30
Committee *; Report *July* 5
Read 3° * *July* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 7
Read 2ª * *July* 11 (No. 158)
Committee *; Report *July* 13
Read 3ª * *July* 14
Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clii]

County Palatine of Lancaster (Clerk of the Peace) Bill
(*Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Holt, Mr. Clifton*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 10 [Bill 53]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 15, [227] 335
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Rathbone*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c." put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee; Report *Feb* 29, 1160
Considered *Mar* 9, 1778
Read 3° * *Mar* 17
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Winmarleigh*) *Mar* 20 (No. 34)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 24, [228] 560
Committee *; Report *Mar* 27
Read 3ª * *Mar* 28
Royal Assent *April* 7 [39 *Vict.* c. iii]

County Rates (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Butt, Mr. Downing, Mr. Richard Smyth*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 27 [Bill 138]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 9, [229] 306
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. W. H. Smith*); after short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Read 2° * *July* 10
Committee [Dropped]

Courtown, Earl of
Grand Juries (Ireland), Res. [229] 1413
Irish Peerage, Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1900; Report, [229] 190

Cowan, Mr. J., *Edinburgh*
Army—Sea Ports—Defences—Firth of Forth, [227] 1565, 1566
Harbours of Refuge—North East Coast, Res. [231] 40
Supply—Friendly Societies, Registry of, [227] 515

Cowen, Mr. J., *Newcastle-on-Tyne*
Agricultural Holdings (England) Act—The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, [228] 963
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1398
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Consid. *cl.* 1, [231] 980
Duke of Schomberg's Pension—Commutation, Res. [231] 755, 758
Egypt—Papers, &c. [228] 1758
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1283; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1416; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 479, 550; 3R. 574
England and France — Extradition — Nadal, Case of, [231] 116
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 848, 912
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 292
Judicature (Ireland)—Court of Common Pleas, [231] 1153
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 63, 65, 208
Parliament—Strangers, Exclusion of—Sessional Order, [229] 1495
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 397
Royal Titles, 3R. [228] 501, 1757
Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, Amendt. [227] 1840
Turkey — Bulgaria, Reported Atrocities in, [231] 734

Cowper, Earl
Criminal Law—Untried Prisoners, Detention of—Case of George Hill, [228] 919
Railway Accidents, Royal Commission on—Brakes, [229] 1098

Crab and Lobster Fisheries
Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 27, [230] 1967

Crab and Lobster Fisheries (Norfolk) Bill (*Mr. Frederick Walpole, Sir Robert Buxton, Mr. Colman*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 17 [Bill 109]
Read 2° * *Mar* 21
Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 26, [230] 429
Committee *; Report *June* 27
Considered * *June* 28
Read 3° * *June* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Suffield*) *June* 30 (No. 154)
Read 2ª * *July* 7
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Read 3ª * *July* 13
Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cli]

CRAWFORD, Mr. J. S., *Down*
Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [229] 182
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [230] 224
Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 990
Tenant Right at the Expiration of Leases (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [228] 2048

CRIMINAL LAW

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Administration in Summary Cases, Observations, Mr. Hopwood; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 16, [229] 1993
Aggravated Assaults on Women—Legislation, Question, Colonel Egerton Leigh; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 18, [227] 481
Bravo, Mr. — The Inquest, Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 18, [229] 922
Buxton Reformatory, Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 13, [227] 1866
Case of James Timony, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 3, [230] 853
Case of Joseph Hadley, Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 27, [228] 627
Cases of Lewis, Platt, and Lancaster—Remission of Sentence, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 31, [231] 115; *August* 7, [231] 697
Case of Margaret M'Fadden, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 16, [228] 68
Case of Mr. Palmer—The Metropolitan Police, Question, Observations, Sir William Fraser; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 7, [228] 1462
Case of Police-Constable Maconachie, Observations, The Earl of Minto; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 27, [228] 599
Case of Thomas Hare—Cumulative Penalties, Question, Mr. Rodwell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 7, [230] 1137
Case of Horatio Walters, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 12, [231] 1206
Constabulary Grants, Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 28, [231] 9

[*cont.*

CRIMINAL LAW—*cont.*
Dietary of Millbank Prison, Question, Mr. Rowley Hill; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 10, [231] 970
Disproportioned Sentences, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 9, [227] 1709
Dog Poisoning, Question, Sir Trevor Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 25, [228] 1635
Escape of Fenian Convicts from Australia, Question, Dr. C. Cameron; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 9, [229] 1604; Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 22, [230] 251
Execution of George Hill, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 4, [229] 34
Expense of Executions, Question, Mr. Fortescue Harrison; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 8, [229] 206
Judicature Act, 1873 — *Untried Prisoners*, Question, Mr. Ryder; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 28, [228] 702; — *Case of George Hill*, Question, Observations, Earl Cowper; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *Mar* 31, 919; — *Winter Assizes*, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 27, 625; Question, Mr. Ryder; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 12, [229] 488; — *The Summer Assizes*, Question, Mr. Cole; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 18, 921; — *The Assizes*, Question, Mr. Cole; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 25, 1187
Mad Dogs, Question, Mr. Sykes; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 23, [229] 1115
Outrages in Jermyn Street, Question, Mr. Thornhill; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 11, [230] 1281
Police at Plymouth, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 10, [231] 975
Police—Devonport Watch Committee, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 9, [229] 263
Pontefract Magistrates — Case of Duggan, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 31, [231] 114
Prison Diet, Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 30, [228] 877
Public Prosecutor, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 25, [229] 1189
Quarter Sessions—Juries' Summons, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 24, [228] 1576
Release of Political Prisoners, Questions, Mr. M. Brooks; Answers, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 9, [227] 1718; *May* 22, [229] 1040
The Convict Christos Baumbos, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 8, [231] 817
The Convict Edward O'Meagher Condon, Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 28, [227] 1025
The Convict Standridge, Question, Mr. Waddy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 8, [229] 207

[*cont.*

Criminal Law—*cont.*

Ireland

Canvassing Jurors, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 27, [230] 1974

The Convict Kirwan, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 3, [231] 424

Trial of Claffey, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *August* 10, [231] 974

The Tichborne Case

Arthur Orton, Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 22, [230] 218

The Queen v. Castro—Witnesses, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 16, [228] 72; Observations, Mr. Whalley; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 17, 246;—*The Trial at Bar—The Orton Portraits and Paintings,* Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 9, [231] 878; *August* 11, 1071

Treatment of the Convict Orton, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 9, [227] 1712; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 26, [229] 1271

Vaccination Act

Arrests, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 22, [229] 1052

Milner's Case, Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 23, [228] 477

Prosecutions, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 16, [228] 62

The Keighley Board of Guardians, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 7, [231] 1139

Wife Desertion—Case of George Warrington, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 14, [227] 2011

Criminal Law—Railway Trains, Throwing Stones at

Moved, for Copy of evidence given before the Salford Police Court (*Earl De La Warr*) *May* 29, [229] 1341; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Criminal Law Evidence Amendment Bill (*Mr. Ashley, Mr. George Clive*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 11 [Bill 61]
Order for 2R. read *May* 24, [229] 1182; after short debate, further proceeding on 2R. adjourned
Further Proceeding on 2R. resumed *July* 26, [230] 1925
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day two months" (*Mr. Rodwell*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Crossed Cheques Bill

(*The Lord Chancellor*)

227] *l.* Presented; read 1^a *Feb* 18, 474 (No. 12)
c. Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, Mr. J. G. Hubbard *Feb* 22, 684
l. Read 2^a *Feb* 29, 1106
Committee * *Mar* 9 (No. 27)
Report * *Mar* 14 (No. 30)
Read 3^a* *Mar* 17
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 21
Read 2° * *April* 6 [Bill 112]
Committee—R.P. *July* 17, [230] 1515
Committee *; Report *July* 24 [Bill 267]
Considered * *August* 8
Moved, "That the Bill be now 3°"
Bill re-committed in respect of Clauses 4, 5, and 12 *August* 14, [231] 1207; Committee; Report; Bill read 3°, with Amendments, and passed
l. Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 81]

Cross, Right Hon. R. A. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Lancashire, S.W.*

Agricultural Children Act—Henry Cole, Case of, [229] 47
Artizans Dwellings, [229] 1669
Bishopric of Truro, 2R. [230] 1761
Borough Boundaries, [227] 2010
Burgesses (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1188
Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1925
Burial Service—Church of England, [228] 881
Burial Services—Dore Burial Case, [228] 469, 966
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1320, 1369
Channel Islands—Miscellaneous Questions
  Jersey, Bailiff of the Royal Court, [228] 352
  Orders in Council, [230] 5, 6, 428, 1622
  Royal Court of, [227] 1120, 1121; [228] 964; [231] 968
Church of England—Halifax, Vicarage of, [230] 1177;—Vicar's Rate, [229] 1520; [231] 973
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 42
Churchyards—Owston Churchyard, [227] 1202
City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1150
Colliery Accidents—Wigan Collieries, [229] 1761
Commercial Frauds, [231] 422
227] Commons, Leave, 186, 196, 197; 2R. 542
229] Comm. 1241, 1243, 1250, 1253, 1382, 1385; *cl.* 2, 1389, 1393, 1394, 1396, 1397, 1398; Motion for reporting Progress, *ib.*, 1400; *cl.* 4, 1523, 1524; *cl.* 8, 1525, 1527, 1528, 1529, 1531; *cl.* 12, 1532, 1533, 1535; *cl.* 18, 1558; *cl.* 22, 1562; *cl.* 25, 1563; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1565, 1567, 1568, 1569, 1570; *add. cl.* 1572; Preamble, 1575, 1576
230] Consid. 131, 134, 135; Amendt. 138, 139, 140
Coroners, Res. [230] 1310
Corrupt Practices at Elections—Norwich and Boston Election Commissions, [229] 1035
County Palatine of Lancaster (Clerk of the Peace), Comm. [227] 1161; Consid. *cl.* 1, 1779

[*cont.*

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
  Crab and Lobster Fisheries (Norfolk), [230] 429 ;—(United Kingdom), 1967
  Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
    Bravo, Mr.—The Inquest, [229] 923
    Buxton Reformatory, [227] 1866
    Dog Poisoning, [228] 1635
    Edward O'Meagher Condon, The Convict, [227] 1025
    George Hill, Execution of, [229] 35
    Horatio Walters, Case of, [231] 1207
    Jermyn Street, Outrages in, [230] 1281
    Judicature Act, 1873—Summer Assizes, [229] 926
    Justice, Delay of—Winter Assizes, [228] 625, 702
    Lewis, Platt, and Lancaster, Cases of—Remission of Sentence, [231] 115
    Mad Dogs, [229] 1116
    Margaret M'Fadden, Case of, [228] 69
    Metropolitan Police—Case of Mr. Palmer, [228] 1465
    Millbank Prison, Dietary of, [231] 871
    Police at Plymouth, [231] 976
    Police—Devonport Watch Committee, [229] 264
    Pontefract Magistrates—Duggan, Case of, [231] 114
    Prison Diet, [228] 877
    Prisoners, Untried, [229] 488
    Public Prosecutor, [229] 1190
    Sentences, Disproportioned, [227] 1709 ;—Remission of, [231] 698
    Standridge, The Convict, [229] 207
    Summary Cases, Administration of, [229] 1998
    Thomas Hare, Case of—Cumulative Penalties, [230] 1138
    Tichborne Case—Arthur Orton, [229] 1271 ; [230] 248 ; Queen v. Castro—Witnesses, [228] 73, 249 ;—Portraits, &c. [231] 879, 1071
    Tichborne Claimant, [227] 1712
    Vaccination Act, Arrests under the, [229] 1052
    Wife Desertion—George Warrington, Case of, [227] 2011
    Women, Aggravated Assaults on, [227] 482

  Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1516
  Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [231] 886 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1147 ; *cl.* 3, 1148, 1149 ; *cl.* 5, 1151 ; *add. cl. ib.*, 1152
  Diocese of Exeter, Leave, [229] 1601
  Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland), 2R. [228] 1162 ; [230] 1048, 1481
  Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Acts, 1871 and 1872, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 374
  Education—Factories Act, 1874—Examinations, [227] 261
  Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), 2R. [229] 1662
  Election Petitions, Trial of, [229] 37
  Electors, Registration of—Parochial Relief, [227] 1205
  Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1289 ; *add. cl.* 1544 ; [231] 10, 25 ; Consid. *cl.* 8, 475 ; *cl.* 16, 554
  Elementary Education Act, 1870—Compulsory Attendance—George Beavis, Case of, [227] 228, 229

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
  Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1180
  Endowed Schools—Assistant Masters, [229] 1420
  England and France — Extradition — Nadal, Case of, [231] 116
  Exhibition Commissioners of 1851—The Financial Position, [230] 254
  Explosive Substances Act, 1875 — Dynamite Explosion in South Wales, [228] 1831 ; [229] 1191 ;—Hamilton, Explosion at, [230] 258 ;—Railway Companies' Bye-Laws, [228] 879
  Factory Acts — Bleachworks and Dyeworks, [228] 1098
  Factory and Workshops Act, [228] 1762 ; [229] 1520
  Factory and Workshop Commission—Report, [228] 618
  Fugitive Slave Commission—The Report, [229] 1976
  Game Laws (Scotland), [227] 1864
  Home Office—Deputations, [230] 1623
  Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 366 ; [230] 1026
  Inland Revenue—Grocers' Wine and Spirit Licences, [227] 1568
  Intemperance—Joint Committee, [230] 1043
  Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) (No. 2), 2R. [228] 1890, 1892
  Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 315, 316
  Law and Justice—Miscellaneous Questions
    Judges' Chambers—Reporters, Admission of, [227] 479
    Judicature Act, 1873 — Official Referees, [227] 302
    Judicature Act, 1875 — Eleventh Section, [229] 1422
    Judicature Acts—Judges on Circuit, [230] 1968
    Jury Law—Legislation, [227] 554
    Justice, Summary Administration of, [227] 812
    Market—Bubble Companies—Fraudulent Practices, &c. [227] 810
    Public Prosecutors—Legislation, [227] 556
    Wilberforce, Mr. R. G., Case of, [227] 675 ; Res. [228] 2019
    Yorkshire Magistracy, [230] 1044
  Licensing Act, 1872—Burial Clubs, [228] 880, 1099
  Liverymen (City of London), Motion for a Return, [228] 1816
  Local Taxation, [227] 1123
  London Municipal Government, Res. [229] 1812
  Mercantile Marine—Miscellaneous Questions
    Horatio Walters, Case of, [231] 1207
    "Lily of Devon," The, [229] 925
    "Lockesley Hall," The, [229] 42 ;—Thames Police Court, Decision at, [228] 1837
  Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 16, [228] 1798 ; *add. cl.* [229] 224, 227 ; Consid. *cl.* 11, 1068
  Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
    Artizans Dwellings Act—Lancashire Court, Bond Street, [231] 1204
    Snow, Removal of, [227] 400
    Street Accidents from Vans, &c., [228] 1482
    Temple Bar, [227] 1203
    University Boat Race — Hammersmith Bridge, [228] 883
  Metropolis (Parochial System), Res. [227] 313

[*cont.*

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
- Metropolitan Fire Brigade—Fire at Chelsea, [230] 1626
- Metropolitan Fire Brigade, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [228] 369
- Metropolitan Police—Helmets, [230] 1819
- Mines—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Blasting Powder, [227] 137, 1022, 1797
  - Coal Mines, Accidents in, [227] 675;—Birley Explosion, [230] 1279;—Clifton Hall Colliery Accident, [231] 1074
  - Reports of Inspectors for 1875, [227] 681
- Municipal Officers Superannuation (No. 2), 2R. [227] 327
- Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  - H.M.S. "Thunderer," [230] 1888, 1971; [231] 8, 1072, 1205
  - "Mistletoe," The, Collision, [227] 259;—Coroner's Jury, [228] 1761;—Further Inquiry, [230] 429
- Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [229] 2020
- Noxious Vapours—A Royal Commission, [230] 1524
- Offences against the Person, Comm. [229] 1784
- Open Spaces (Metropolitan District), Comm. [228] 428
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - East Suffolk Election, [227] 2009
  - Norwich and Boston, Boroughs of, [229] 1345
  - Public Business, [229] 492, 1195, 1356, 2017
- Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 327
- Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Boroughs), 3R. [229] 1783
- Parliamentary Franchise—Liverymen of London, [228] 1321
- Police Superannuation—Special Committee, Report, [227] 814
- Pollution of Rivers, 3R. [231] 558
- Pollution of Rivers—The Clyde, [228] 1909
- Poor Law Amendment (Scotland), [230] 1049
- Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 260
- Prisons, Leave, [229] 1536, 1553; 2R. [230] 314, 918
- Prisons Bill—Prison Chaplains, [230] 737;—Roman Catholic Chaplains, 1395
- Prisons (Scotland), [231] 704
- Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 1811, 1812, 1813
- Public Meetings—Freedom of Discussion, [228] 1327
- Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1443
- Queenborough Harbour, 3R. [229] 1970
- Railway Accident Commission—Frederick Harcombe, Case of, [229] 1518
- Record Office—Destruction and Sale of Public Records, [231] 693
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), [229] 366
- Roads (Scotland)—Legislation, [227] 479
- Salmon Fisheries Act, 1861—The Solway, [230] 1175
- Salmon Fisheries Act, 1873—Fishery Board, [229] 1893
- Salmon Fisheries Inspectors' Report — The Wye, [229] 264, 1972
- Scientific Instruction, Royal Commission on, [227] 551
- Scotland—Ayr, Fatal Fire in, [230] 419
- Sheriff Courts (Scotland), 2R. [231] 563
- Sunday Trading—Bakers Act, [228] 62

[*cont.*

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
- Supply—Convict Establishments, England and the Colonies, [228] 592
  - Metropolitan Police, [228] 591
  - Metropolitan Police Courts, [229] 1591
  - Police, County and Borough, [228] 337, 592
  - Public Buildings, [229] 1584
  - Report, [227] 996; [228] 687
- Sweden—Stockholm, British Church at, [231] 716
- United States — Extradition—Winslow, Case of, [228] 1909; [229] 1113;—Caldwell, Case of, [230] 946
- University of Cambridge, Leave, [229] 837
- Unreformed Municipal Corporations (England and Wales), [227] 1157;—Royal Commission, [228] 479; [229] 182
- Vivisection—Legislation, [228] 476;—Royal Commission, Report, [227] 819
- Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1366

Cross, Mr. J. K., *Bolton*
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1293, 1294; *add. cl.* 1657; [231] 19
- Public Health—Eagley, Typhoid Fever at, [228] 1474

Cruelty to Animals Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Carnarvon*)

l. Presented; read 1^{a} * *May* 15 (No. 85)
229] Read 2^{a}, after short debate *May* 22, 1001
Observations, Viscount Cardwell; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *May* 29, 1340
Committee put off sine die
230] Committee, after short debate *June* 20, 105
Report * *June* 26 (No. 131)
Read 3^{a} *June* 27, 486 (No. 144)
Commons Amendts. (No. 237)
c. Read 1^{o} * (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *July* 18
231] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{o}" *August* 9, 886
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "this day month" (*Dr. Ward*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2^{o} [Bill 250]
Committee *—R.P. *August* 10
Committee; Report *August* 11, 1147
Considered *; read 3^{o} *August* 12
l. Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 77]

Cruelty to Animals Bill
(*Mr. Holt, Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Wait, Mr. Wilson*)

c. Ordered; read 1^{o} * *May* 24 [Bill 168]
2R. [Dropped]

Cubitt, Mr. G., *Surrey, W.*
- Agricultural Holdings (England) Act—The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, [228] 963
- Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 365

Cuninghame, Sir W. J. M., *Ayr, &c.*
- Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 212
- Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [228] 15, 22
- Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1627
- Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1214
- Supply—Fishery Board (Scotland), Amendt. [227] 991

Cust, Major H. F. C., *Grantham*
India—Bishopric in Northern India, [229] 264

Customs
Memorial of Officers, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 22, [230] 251
Office of the Solicitor, Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 7, [231] 700
[*Customs*—See title *Civil Service Inquiry Commission*]

Customs Acts Consolidation
Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 24, [228] 1578

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Resolutions [April 6] reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *April* 7 [Bill 124]
229] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 15, 673
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House regrets that the progressive increase of expenditure recommended by Her Majesty's Government should have led to a proposal by Her Majesty's Government to add to the Income Tax in the present year" (*Mr. Rylands*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 263; N. 175; M. 88
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 18, 965
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is inexpedient to extend the range of absolute exemption from Income Tax to incomes of £150, and to extend the limit of partial exemption from incomes of £300 to incomes of £400, inasmuch as these additional exemptions would injuriously affect the equable proportion in which all incomes of like nature should be assessed" (*Mr. Hubbard*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 241, N. 121; M 120
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.
Committee; Report *May* 25, 1197
Considered * *May* 26
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *May* 29, 1357
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, no financial arrangements can be satisfactory which are so framed as to make no provision for relieving Ireland from a burden of Taxation beyond her ability to pay as compared with Great Britain" (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°
[*cont.*

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 29
Read 2ª; Committee negatived; Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. considered, and dispensed with; Read 3ª *May* 30
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 16]

Customs Duties Consolidation Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 9 [Bill 188]
Read 2° * *June* 15
Committee *; Report *July* 3
Considered * *July* 6
Read 3° * *July* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 10
Read 2ª * *July* 13 (No. 162)
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 35]

Customs Laws Consolidation Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *May* 18 [Bills 154-154A]
Read 2° *June* 15, [229] 1962
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 3, [230] 936; Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Committee; Report
Considered * *July* 6
Read 3° * *July* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 10
Read 2ª * *July* 13 (No. 163)
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 36]

Customs—The Wine Duties
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present system of levying the Customs Duties on Wine" (*Mr. William Cartwright*) *Mar* 7, [227] 1569; after short debate, Question put, and negatived

Dalkeith, Lord, *Edinburghshire*
Roads (Scotland)—Legislation, [227] 479

Dalrymple, Mr. C., *Buteshire*
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 216
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 24
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1458, 1462
Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 485
India—Uncovenanted Civil Service, [227] 1869
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) (No. 2), 2R. [228] 1890
[*cont.*

DALRYMPLE, Mr. C.—*cont.*
- Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1371, 1387
- Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [228] 1812
- Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1447
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), [229] 366
- United Parishes (Scotland), 2R. [227] 661

DAVENPORT, Mr. W. BROMLEY-, *Warwickshire, N.*
- Channel Tunnel Scheme, [229] 1665
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 15, [228] 1612
- Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, Res. [228] 1249
- Parliament—Derby Day, [229] 1430
- Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 1103

DAVIES, Mr. D., *Cardigan*
- Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 725
- Elementary Education, 2R. [229] 1928 ; Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1722
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 66
- Slave Trade (East Africa), Res. [228] 1231
- Supply, Report, [227] 996
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1139

DEASE, Mr. E., *Queen's Co.*
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Militia Regiments, Supplies to, [229] 926
  - Militia Staff Sergeants—Pensions, [229] 1424
  - Queen's County Militia Regiments, [229] 1424

DE LA WARR, Earl
- Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Motion for Returns, [229] 1260, 1263
- Criminal Law—Throwing Stones at Railway Trains, [229] 1341
- Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [230] 1464
- Malta, Fortifications of, [230] 487
- Primary Education, Motion for Returns, [229] 96
- Railway Accidents, Royal Commission on — Brakes, [229] 1098
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Insurrectionary Provinces, [230] 387
  - Salonica, Outrage at, [229] 914 ;—Murder of the Consuls, [230] 847
  - Sultan, Reported Deposition of the, [229] 1416
  - Treaty of Paris, 1856, [229] 1888

DE MAULEY, Lord
- Egypt— Slave Trade, Res. [228] 257, 261

DENBIGH, Earl of
- Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [230] 1457, 1463

DENISON, Mr. C. BECKETT-, *Yorkshire, W.R., E. Div.*
- Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 124
- H.R.H. the Prince of Wales—Visit to India —Expenditure, [231] 1077

[*cont.*

DENISON, Mr. C. BECKETT—*cont.*
- India—Exchanges, The, [227] 262
- Indian Legislation, 2R. [227] 467
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 6, [228] 1161
- Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, Res. [229] 1576, 1583
- Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1603
- Parliament—Public Business, [228] 1328
  - Relevancy of Debate—Appropriation Bill, [231] 1161
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 141, 145
- Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 339
  - Home and Colonial Offices, [229] 1587
  - Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company, [228] 337
  - New Palace at Westminster—Acquisition of Lands and Embankment, [229] 1594
  - Public Buildings, [229] 1584, 1585
  - Report, [229] 1757 ;—Suez Canal—Modification of Dues, [228] 1573
  - Royal Parks and Gardens, [229] 1583
  - War Office on Account of India, [228] 341

DENMAN, Lord
- Appeals—Standing Orders, Res. [227] 1201
- Appellate Jurisdiction, 1R. [227] 224 ; 2R. 917 ; Commons Amendts. Amendt. [231] 946, 959
- Irish Peerage, 2R. [228] 1174
- Royal Titles, 3R. [228] 1392

DERBY, Earl of (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
- Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Motion for Returns, [229] 1262
- Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [230] 1461, 1463
- Egypt—Cave, Mr., Mission of, [227] 202
  - Khedive, The, and the New Legal Tribunals, [231] 965
- Egypt—Slave Trade, Res. [228] 259
- Exchequer Bonds — Personal Explanation, [227] 1500, 1505
- Fiji, Address for Papers, [230] 1692
- Firman on Reforms—Sublime Porte—Andrassy Note, Address for Papers, [227] 1409
- Foreign Decorations, [229] 1265, 1415
- Fugitive Slaves—Coolies, [228] 255
- Fugitive Slaves, Reception of—Commons Debate, Personal Explanation, [227] 907, 908 ; —Circulars, Petition, 1547, 1551
- India | Indian Tariff, [227] 1947
- Merchant Shipping, 2R. [230] 333
- Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 23, 32
- Roumania, Commercial Treaty with, [231] 1193
- Sugar Convention, 1875—Refusal of the Dutch Chambers, [228] 558
- Sweden — Stockholm, Episcopal Church at, [229] 1887
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Berlin Memorandum, [230] 411
  - Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [230] 1168 ; [231] 1059
  - Eastern Question—The Papers, [230] 1766
  - Insurrectionary Provinces, [230] 386, 388
  - Salonica, Outrage at, [229] 915 ;—Murder of the Consuls, [230] 847
  - Second Note of the Three Powers, [229] 1000, 1512

[*cont.*

Derby, Earl of—*cont.*
  Servia, Declaration of War by, [230] 610
  Servian Army, Russian Officers in the, [230] 824
  Sultan, Reported Deposition of the, [229] 1416
  Treaty of Paris, 1856, [229] 1891
 Turkey—Treaties of 1856, Res. [231] 94, 97
 United States—Extradition Treaty—Winslow, Case of, [229] 33; [230] 1617; Address for Correspondence, 1783

Devon, Earl of
 Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 758

Devonshire, Duke of
 University of Oxford, 1R. [227] 803; Comm. [228] 926

Dickson, Major A. G., *Dover*
 Army—Military Etiquette, [231] 1158
 Dover, East Cliff at, [231] 1154
 Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 301
 Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1601

Dickson, Mr. T. A., *Dungannon*
 Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 729

Digby, Hon. Captain E. T., *Dorsetshire*
 Mercantile Marine—"Royal Adelaide," Wreck of the, [227] 1868

Digby, Mr. K. T., *Queen's Co.*
 Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 289

Dilke, Sir C. W., *Chelsea, &c.*
 Barbadoes—Alleged Riots, [228] 1627
 China, Res. [230] 563
 City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1148, 1149
 Commons, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 1250, 1379, 1381, 1384; *cl.* 2, 1392, 1397; *cl.* 12, 1534; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1562; Consid. Amendt. [230] 131, 133
 Cuba—Chinese Coolies, [230] 616
 Diplomatic and Consular Service—Stockholm, British Vice Consul at, [229] 40
 Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1461, 1462
 Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 99; Comm. *cl.* 11, 1445; Amendt. 1448; *cl.* 20, 1500; Consid. *cl.* 14, Motion for Adjournment, [231] 485, 495
 Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London), Comm. [231] 1186
 Fine Arts—Motion for an Address, [229] 265, 284, 285, 304
 House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 551, 553
 India—Malay Peninsula—Birch, Mr., Murder of, [229] 1295
 Japan and Corea, Dispute between, [227] 2014
 Japan—Newspaper Regulations, [228] 478, 1473
 Juries (Dublin), Leave, Motion for Adjournment, [231] 665
 Merchant Shipping, [229] 1274; Lords Amendts. Consid. [231] 1184

[*cont.*

Dilke, Sir C. W.—*cont.*
 Metropolis Gas Act, 1860—Gas Companies' Accounts, [229] 204
 Navy—Mediterranean Squadron, [230] 1819
 Open Spaces (Metropolitan District), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 427
 Parliament—Public Business, [228] 1184; [231] 125, 126
  Relevancy of Debate—Appropriation Bill, [231] 1160, 1162
 Plumstead and Wormholt Commons, Res. Amendt. [231] 821
 Pollution of Rivers, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 1675, 1876, 1880; Consid. Motion for Adjournment, [231] 284
 Pollution of Rivers—Thames Water, [228] 1578
 Queenborough Harbour, 3R. Amendt. [229] 1967
 Royal Titles Act, [228] 1983
 Russia and Corea, [228] 170
 South Kensington Museum—Gratuities to the Police, [231] 1230
 Supply—Report—Suez Canal—Modification of Dues, [228] 1573
 Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [231] 1119
  Eastern Question, The—Roumania, [230] 1527
  Loans of 1854 and 1855, [231] 1203
  Servia—Revolted Provinces, [230] 737
 University of Cambridge, Leave, [229] 835; 2R. Amendt. [230] 1056, 1126
 University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1750
 Unreformed Municipal Corporation Commission, [229] 182
 Unreformed Municipal Corporations (England and Wales), Res. [227] 1126, 1159, 1160;—Lostwithiel, Explanation, [228] 1;—Yarmouth and Brading—Isle of Wight, [229] 1620
 Ways and Means—Report, Res. [231] 758

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
 Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland), Lords Amendts. [230] 1272
 Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1229
 Army and Navy Expenditure Accounts, Audit of, [229] 2011
 Army Purchase Estimate—Army Purchase Commission, [229] 2022
 Bishopric of Truro, 2R. [230] 984; Amendt. 1761; Comm. *cl.* 6, 2021
 Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 1036, 1037
 Chief Commissioner of Works, Office of, [231] 695
 Church Bodies (Gibraltar)—The Ordinances, [228] 66, 67; Motion for an Address, 767, 769; [230] 1399
 Commons, Comm. [229] 1252
 Consolidated Fund, 3R. [228] 564, 566
 Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 6, Motion for reporting Progress, [230] 1515
 Customs Laws Consolidation, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 936
 Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 15, Amendt. [230] 1496; *cl.* 20, 1499; *cl.* 26, 1504; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 480, 481
 Erne Lough and River, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 1764
 Fine Arts, Motion for an Address, [227] 281

[*cont.*

DILLWYN, Mr. L. L.—*cont.*
Gibraltar, Church Endowments in, [227] 225, 262
Highways, Leave, [228] 1554
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 552
Increase of the Episcopate, Leave, [227] 116; 2R. 357; [230] 1027
Lunatics, Committal and Treatment of, [230] 1164
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 1947; Amendt. *ib*
Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, Res. [228] 1249
Navy, Administration of the, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 456
Parliament — Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London), [230] 1179
Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 498
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, Res. [231] 707
Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1676; Motion for Adjournment, 1878; 3R. Amendt. [231] 556, 561
Post Office—Telegraph Service, [227] 1207
Queenborough Harbour, 3R. [229] 1970
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 510
Constabulary (Ireland), [228] 593
Local Government Board, &c. [227] 519
Metropolitan Police, [228] 591
Police, County and Borough, [228] 591, 592
Suez Canal Shares, [227] 298

Diocese of Exeter Bill—See title
Bishopric of Truro Bill

Diplomatic and Consular Service—British Vice Consul at Stockholm

Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 4, [229] 40

DISRAELI, Right Hon. B., (First Lord of the Treasury), *Buckinghamshire*
Admiralty, The—Civilian First Lords, Res. [227] 1879
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [229] 1680; Comm. [230] 984
Army — King George of Hanover, [230] 256
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1278
Barbadoes—The Riots, [228] 1763
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1387
Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 133
Chief Commissioner of Works, Office of, [231] 695
Criminal Law—Fenian Prisoners, [227] 1718; —The Escaped, [230] 251
Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1040
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [231] 931

[*cont.*

DISRAELI, Right Hon. B.—*cont.*
Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
Egyptian Finance — Mr. Cave's Report, [227] 1870; [228] 74, 480, 699
Mr. Cave's Mission, [228] 567, 623
National Bank of, [227] 1418
National Bank, the Proposed, [228] 627
Papers, &c. [228] 1758
Egypt—Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Report, Res. [231] 644
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1485
Elementary Education, 2R. [229] 1959; Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1911; [231] 20; Motion for reporting Progress, 26, 27
Equity Courts (Ireland)—Lord Justice Christian, [227] 1871, 2016
Exchequer Bonds, Comm. *cl.* 2, [227] 1401; 3R. 1424, 1429, 1435
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 884, 886, 901
Heligoland, [229] 1972
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 371
Ireland—Papal Authority in, [230] 949
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 819, 1560
Lisbon Tramways Company — Twycross v. Grant, Personal Explanation, [230] 1484
Mercantile Marine—Lighthouses, [228] 469
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 94; Lords Amendts. [231] 696
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1095, 1097
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 88
Derby Day, Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1425
Order—Debates in the House of Lords, Reference to, [229] 1625
Petition of Mr. C. Henwood—Exclusion of Strangers, [227] 1420
Private Bill Legislation, [230] 1136
Privilege—Messrs. Rothschild, [227] 1019
227] Public Business, Arrangement of, 1124, 1125
228] 1181, 1183, 1184, 1185, 1330, 1331, 1837, 1912, 1986
229] 107, 1054; Motion for Adjournment, 1196, 1356, 1555, 1666
230] 8, 9, 130, 430, 621, 622, 1634, 1636, 1637, 1640, 1968, 1975, 1976
231] 122, 123, 124, 126, 977;—Easter Recess, [228] 1100;—Whitsuntide Recess, Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1522
Sessional Order, 1875 — Strangers, Presence of, [229] 1355, 1494, 1495, 1555
Strangers, Exclusion of, [228] 1480
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [227] 469, 472, 473; [231] 704, 706
Parliament — Privilege — Irregular Petitions, [228] 1402; Motion for Adjournment, 1558
Parliament—Privilege—Political Committee of the Reform Club, Res. [229] 1674
Parliament—Public Petition from a Foreign Town — Boulogne-Sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1412, 1420
Parliamentary Boroughs (Ireland), [228] 1906
Peru — Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, [228] 623
Prisons, 2R. [230] 933, 935
Privy Council (Oaths of Members, &c.), Address for Returns, [228] 2033, 2037

[*cont.*

DISRAELI, Right Hon. B.—*cont.*
Queen's Visit to Germany, [228] 700, 701, 882, 883
Railways, Royal Commission on, [227] 552
Royal Style and Titles,—Native Princes of India, The, [227] 1867, 2013
227] Royal Titles, Leave, 407, 408, 421, 424, 425, 427, 1568 ; 2R. 1719, 1760
228] Comm. 147, 156, 157, 272 ; *cl.* 1, 278, 293, 296, 299, 302, 319 ; 3R. 492, 1098, 1983
Royal Titles—The Proclamation, [228] 881, 1574, 1632, 1764, 1765, 1769, 1770
Royal Titles Act Proclamation, Notice of Res. [229] 51 ;—Vote of Censure, Res. 376, 455
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [231] 429
Slavery, &c. —Fugitive Slaves—Royal Commission, [227] 266, 398
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 852
Supply, Comm. [230] 431
  Lord Privy Seal, [227] 502
  Report, [227] 997, 999, 1000
  Suez Canal Shares, [227] 289, 298 ; Res. 652
Toll Bridges (River Thames), [230] 1624
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Berlin Conference, [229] 1053
  Bosnia and Herzegovina, [230] 1170
  Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [230] 425 1181, 1185, 1476 ; [231] 1100, 1129, 1138
  Eastern Question, The, [230] 256, 876, 884 ; —Ministerial Statement, 265, 1486 ; —Official Declaration, 1813 ;—Papers, 947, 1174
  Geneva Convention, [231] 702
  Ministerial Statement, [229] 1521 ;—Berlin Note, 1606, 1609
  Naval Force in Turkish Waters, [230] 1960
  Ministers, Assassination of, [229] 1975
  Montenegro, [229] 106
  Revolted Provinces—Reported Outbreak of Hostilities, [230] 873, 1970
  Salonica Murders—Correspondence, [230] 1820, 1821, 1822
  Servia, [230] 623
Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Insurrection in, Res. [231] 202, 211, 225
Turkey and Greece — Circassians, Proposed Settlement of, [231] 122
United States—Emma Mine, [229] 1352
War in the East, [231] 970
West Africa—Gambia Settlement, [227] 561

Divine Worship Facilities Bill
(*Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Mr. Birley, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Rodwell*)
c. Considered in Committee ; Resolution agreed to, and reported ; Bill ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 30]
2R., Debate adjourned *Mar* 15
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

Divorce, Law of
Question, Colonel Egerton Leigh ; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 15, [229] 667

DIXON, Mr. G., *Birmingham*
Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 963 ; 2R. 1946
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1251, 1258, 1285, 1300

DODDS, Mr. J., *Stockton*
Game Laws Amendment, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 1816
Henwood, Mr. Charles, Petition of, Res. [228] 344
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 1624
Local Light Dues (Reduction), Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 1963
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 106, Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 913, 914
Offences against the Person, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 1622, 1623
Parliamentary Agents, Motion for a Committee, [230] 574
Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1468

DODSON, Right Hon. J. G., *Chester*
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 12, 1534, 1535 ; *cl.* 22, [229] 1562
Consolidated Fund, 3R. [227] 1437
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 971 ; *cl.* 2, 1201 ; *add. cl.* 1216
Egypt—Suez Canal — Management of, [229] 180 ; — Representation and Management, 1604
Egypt—Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Report, Res. [231] 627, 653
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 11, [230] 1448 ; *add. cl.* 1835 ; [231] 24, 27 ; Consid. *cl.* 14, 533
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1162
Exchequer Bonds, 3R. [227] 1422
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 371
Loans (Ireland), [230] 261
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 106, [228] 913
Offences against the Person, Comm. [227] 1190
Parliament—Order—Debates in the House of Lords, Reference to, [229] 1628, 1629
  Strangers, Exclusion of, [228] 1480
Parliament, Acts of—Report of Select Committee, Res. [228] 572
Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 499
Parliament—Public Petitions from a Foreign Town — Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1417
Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 328
Prisons, Leave, [229] 1550 ; 2R. [230] 304
Spain—Justice, Miscarriage of—Murder of a British Subject, [228] 1626
Supply—Royal Palaces, [228] 251
  Surveys of the United Kingdom, [229] 1589
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1126, 1127
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1363

DONOUGHMORE, Earl of
Grand Juries (Ireland), Res. [229] 1401, 1414
National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, [229] 351

DORCHESTER, Lord
Army—Reserves, Address for Papers, [231] 688

Dover Harbour
Petition (*Earl Granville*) *May* 23, [229] 1099; after short debate, Petition to lie on the Table
Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 29, [229] 1346; Question, Mr. Freshfield; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 7, [231] 691
The East Cliff, Observations, Major Dickson; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 12, [231] 1154

Dover Harbour Bill
Question, Mr. Freshfield; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 10, [227] 136

Dover Pier—English and Foreign Mail Boats
Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 25, [230] 1885

DOWNING, Mr. M'Carthy, *Cork Co.*
Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1037
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), [227] 1124
Customs—Officers, Memorial of, [230] 251, 252
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 782
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Fisheries—Cape Clear Island, [230] 253
  Land Owners, [230] 1047
  Registry of Deeds Office, Report, [228] 621
Ireland—Poor Law Rating, Res. [229] 841
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker), Res. [229] 1437
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, Amendt. [230] 142, 143, 145; Amendt. 269; Amendt. 271; 3R. 340
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 640
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 218, 219, 221
Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 1991
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. [228] 1469
Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 16
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1363
United States — International Exhibition, Philadelphia — British Commission, [230] 1479

Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered * *Feb* 14
Read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 71]
Read 2° * *Feb* 17
Committee *; Report *Feb* 25
Read 3° * *Feb* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *Feb* 29
Read 2ª * *Mar* 9 (No. 21)
Committee *; Report *Mar* 10
Read 3ª * *Mar* 13
Royal Assent *Mar* 17 [39 *Vict.* c. ii]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 8 [Bill 99]
Read 2° * *Mar* 13
Committee *; Report *Mar* 20
Read 3° * *Mar* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 23
Read 2ª * *Mar* 31 (No. 39)
Committee *; Report *April* 3
Read 3ª * *April* 7
Royal Assent *April* 27 [39 *Vict.* c. 8]

Drugging of Animals Bill
(*Sir John Astley, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Rodwell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 23 [Bill 85]
Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 6, [227] 1490
Committee *; Report *Mar* 31
Considered * *April* 3
Read 3° * *April* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Meldrum*) *April* 6 (No. 53)
Read 2ª, after short debate *May* 9, [229] 261
Committee *; Report *May* 15
Read 3ª * *May* 22
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 13]

Dublin City Bill
(*Mr. Sullivan, Dr. Ward, Mr. Arthur Moore*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 19 [Bill 201]
Referred to the Examiners

DUFF, Mr. M. E. Grant, *Elgin, &c.*
Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 140
Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [227] 1282
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [231] 1052
India—Bengal Famine, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1875
Poor Law (Scotland), Comm. [230] 524
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 122
Spain—The Constitution, Article 11—Religious Toleration, [230] 6
University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1098, 1099, 1107
University of Oxford, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1747

DUFF, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 26
Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [227] 991, 994

DUNBAR, Mr. J., *New Ross*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1465
Army Medical Department, [231] 1076
Army Medical Officers, [228] 476
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 713
Civil Service Inquiry Commission—Report, [227] 134
India—Bombay Revenue Jurisdiction Act, 1876, [229] 926
Inland Revenue Department, [227] 556

DUNDAS, Hon. J. C., *Richmond*
Poor Law—Out-door Relief, [228] 876

DUNSANY, Lord
Irish Peerage, 2R. [228] 1175; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1900; Report, [229] 201
Iron-clads, Motion for Returns, [227] 1855

DYNEVOR, Lord
Burials in Churchyards, 2R. [229] 1093
Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [227] 1199
Felstead School—The Rev. W. Grignon, Dismissal of, [228] 1755

DYOTT, Colonel R., *Lichfield*
Army Reserve Forces—Stafford Militia, [229] 1821

EARP, Mr. T., *Newark*
Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 28, Amendt. [231] 555
Friendly Societies Act—Registration Clause, [229] 103
Post Office—Letter-Carriers' Uniform, [230] 245
Prisons, Leave, [229] 1552

East India (Chief Justices of High Courts) Bill (*Sir George Campbell, Sir George Balfour, Mr. Kinnaird*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 8 [Bill 98]
2R. [House counted out] *May* 23, [229] 1153
2R. [Dropped]

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *Mar* 14, [227] 2076; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 106]
2R. deferred, after short debate *April* 3, [228] 1162
Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 6, [230] 1048; *July* 17, 1481
Bill withdrawn * *July* 17

Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Acts, 1871, 1872
Moved that a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the operation of the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Acts of 1871 and 1872" (*Mr. Goldney*) *Mar* 21, [228] 371; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *Mar* 27, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Goldney (Chairman), Mr. Birley, Lord George Cavendish, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Forester, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Monk, Mr. Cowper-Temple, Mr. Wait, Mr. Walter, Sir Sydney Waterlow
Report and Index . . . . . *P.P.* 258

Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 10 (No. 3)
Read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee, after short debate *Mar* 2, [227] 1191
And, on *Mar* 7, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Abp. Canterbury, Ld. Chancellor, M. Salisbury, Ld. Steward, E. Shaftesbury, E. Stanhope, E. Powis, E. Nelson, V. Halifax, V. Cardwell, L. Bp. Gloucester and Bristol, L. Bp. Ely, L. Strafford, L. Hatherley, L. Winmarleigh
Report of Select Comm. *May* 26 [No. 93]
Bill reported * *May* 26 (No. 94)
Committee, after short debate *June* 16, [229] 1964 (No. 123)
Report * *June* 19
Read 3ª* *June* 22
c. Read 1°* (*Sir John Kennaway*) *July* 4
2R. [Dropped] [Bill 232]

Edinburgh Improvement Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)
c. Read 2°, after short debate *June* 22, [230] 241

EDMONSTONE, Admiral Sir W., *Stirlingshire*
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 200
Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, Motion for Adjournment, [230] 1923
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1637
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 75
Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. [230] 167
Parliament—Strangers, Exclusion of, Res. [229] 1819
Prisons, 2R. [230] 300
Protection to Growing Crops (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1028
River Gambia, Res. [228] 2004

EDUCATION
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Endowed Schools
Question, Mr. Waddy; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Feb* 10, [227] 134
Assistant Masters—Felstead School, Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 30, [229] 1420; —*Dismissal of Rev. W. Grignon*, Observations, Lord Campbell; short debate thereon *April* 27, [228] 1746
Nuneaton Grammar School, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 23, [228] 701
Perse Grammar School—Dismissal of Assistant Master, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 13, [229] 1763
St. John's Hospital, Exeter—The New Scheme, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 4, [229] 38
Tideswell Grammar School, Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 1, [229] 1515
Uppingham School, Question, Mr. Gerard Noel; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 4, [229] 49
Report of Committee of Council, 1875-6 . . . [1513, 1513-I-II-III]
New Code of Regulations, 1876 . [1458]

[*cont*

Education—*cont.*

Education Department

Canal Population, The, Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 3, [230] 859

Factories Act, 1874—*The Educational Clause*, Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 14, [227] 261

Government Inspectors and Secondary Schools, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 13, [230] 1396

Grants to Elementary Schools—Keynsham British School, Questions, Mr. Mundella, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Viscount Sandon *June* 15, [229] 1894; Questions, Mr. Mundella; Answers, Viscount Sandon *June* 16, 1974; *June* 22, [230] 246; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Viscount Sandon *August* 1, [231] 256

Papers relating to . . . . . *P.P* 330

Legislation, Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 9, [227] 1714

Primary Education — The Queen's Speech—Legislation, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 27, [228] 620; Question, Lord Francis Hervey; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 7, 1410

Pupil Teachers, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Viscount Sandon *August* 11, [231] 1069

Reports for the Year 1875, Question, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *May* 26, [229] 1260

Schools and Attendances (*England and Wales*), Question, Observations, Lord Aberdare; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *August* 4, [231] 513

Teachers of Public Elementary Schools—Certificates, Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster; Reply, Viscount Sandon *August* 1, [231] 258

[See title *Elementary Education Act*, 1870]

Education Department — The Education Code—Choice of Subjects

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 10, To leave out from " That," and add " while reading, writing, and arithmetic should be obligatory in all Elementary Schools, it is desirable that the choice of other subjects should, as heretofore, be left to the School Board or Committee of Management " (*Sir John Lubbock*) *v.*, [227] 1800; after short debate, Question, " That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Edwards, Mr. H., *Weymouth*

Metropolis—Temple Bar, [227] 1203

Egerton of Tatton, Lord

Poor Law Amendment, 2R. [230] 1275

Egerton, Hon. A. F. (Secretary to the Board of Admiralty), *Lancashire, S.E.*

Administration of the Navy, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 453

Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 230

[cont.

Egerton, Hon. A. F.—*cont.*

Navy—Miscellaneous Questions

Good Conduct Badges, [230] 1045

H.M.S. " Monarch " and the " Raleigh," [231] 1202

Naval Surgeons—Sir Gilbert Blane's Bequest, [230] 1043

Royal Marines, [228] 1526, 1527

Navy—H.M.S. " Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1093

Navy Estimates, Dockyards, &c. [230] 466

Training Ships (Ireland), [230] 1049

Egerton, Hon. Admiral F., *Derbyshire, E.*

Mercantile Marine—" Strathmore," The, [230] 243

Navy—Royal Marines, [228] 1523

Navy—" Alberta " and " Mistletoe," Collision, Res. [228] 1516

Navy—H.M.S. " Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1074

West Indies—St. Vincent, Island of, [230] 1170

Egerton, Hon. Wilbraham, *Cheshire, Mid*

Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1921

Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2061

Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [228] 42

Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1295; *add. cl.* 1668; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 480

Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 366

Egypt

Miscellaneous Questions

Court of Summary Justice, Question, Mr. Ralli; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 21, [230] 1698

Judicial Reforms . . . *P.P.* [1393]

The Khedive and the New Legal Tribunals—The Private Estate, Question, Observations, Lord Emly; Reply, The Earl of Derby *August* 10, [231] 964

Egyptian Finance

227] *Mr. Cave's Special Mission—The Instructions*,
Notice of Question, The Marquess of Har-
tington *Feb* 10, 138; Question, Observa-
tions, The Earl of Rosebery; Reply, The
Earl of Derby *Feb* 11, 202; Notice of
Question, The Marquess of Hartington
228] *Mar* 24, 563; Questions, The Marquess of
Hartington, Mr. Lowe; Answers, Mr. Dis-
raeli, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 24, 566;—*The
Expenses*, Question, The Marquess of Hart-
ington; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 27, 623
227] *Mr. Cave's Report*, Question, Mr. J. W.
Barclay; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 13,
1870; Questions, Mr. J. W. Barclay, Mr.
Lowe; Answers, Mr. Disraeli, The Chan-
228] cellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 16, 74;
Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer,
Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 23, 480; Question, Mr.
Samuelson; Answer, The Chancellor of the
Exchequer *Mar* 27, 621; Questions, Sir
George Campbell, Sir H. Drummond Wolff;
Answers, Mr. Disraeli, The Chancellor of
the Exchequer *Mar* 28, 699; Observation,
The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 31,
1038; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; An-
swer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer
230] *June* 19, 11

[cont.

Egypt—*cont.*

Mr. Rivers Wilson, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 6, [228] 1325; Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 11, [229] 365
Conversion of the Debt—Decrees of May 2, Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 18; [229] 918
Ministry of Finance—The Decree, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 16, [229] 775; Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 23, 1112
The Egyptian Debt—Mr. Cave's Report, Question, Mr. William Cartwright; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 12, [229] 490

Mr. Cave's Report . . . *P.P.* [1425]
Correspondence . . . . [1484]

Imprisonment of General Kirkham, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 17, [230] 1477
The National Bank of Egypt, Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 6, [227] 1417; Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 9, 1707; Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 27, [228] 627;—*Papers, &c.*, Question, Mr. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 27, [228] 1758
The Ministry of War—General Pettie, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 14, [227] 266;—*General Fadeieff*, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 28, 1022
The Red Sea Boundary, Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 24, [230] 1809

The Suez Canal Shares
The Purchase of the Suez Canal Shares, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 11, [227] 226;—*Commissions*, Question, Mr. Wilson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 29, 1120
Bank of England—The Loans Act, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, [228] 269; Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 351
Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 30, 1417

The Suez Canal Company
The Concession and Firman, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 10, [227] 137
The Statutes and Bye-Laws, Questions, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 11, [227] 229; *Feb* 14, 265

The Suez Canal
English Representatives, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 21, [227] 561

[*cont.*

Egypt—*cont.*
Modification of the Canal Dues, Questions, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 22, [227] 684; *Feb* 24, 812; Observations, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *April* 11, [228] 1562
Payment of the Interest, Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 1, [229] 1521
Sir Daniel Lange, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 2, [227] 1207
The Administration—The Surtax, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 6, [228] 1326
227] *The Representation and Management*, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 2011;
229] *May* 4, 39; Observations, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 5, 172; Questions, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 9, 1604

Correspondence . [1391], [1392], [1525]
Mem. Lord Tenterden . . . . [1415]
Concession and Firmans . . . . [1416]

Egypt—Mr. Cave's Mission—Egyptian Finance
Moved, "That it is inexpedient that the British Government should take any part to facilitate loan transactions to the Khedive of Egypt" (*Sir George Campbell*) *August* 5, [231] 615
Observations, Sir George Campbell; Reply, Mr. Stephen Cave; debate thereon *August* 5, 615

Egypt—The Slave Trade
Moved to resolve, That this House regrets that the policy of the Government was not directed to the suppression of the Slave Trade in the transactions with the Khedive of Egypt (*The Lord De Mauley*) *Mar* 20, [228] 257; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
[See title *Slave Trade*]

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
Army—Mobilization Scheme, The New, [230] 380
Volunteer Review in Hyde Park, [230] 622
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1466, 1479
Warlike and other Stores, [229] 1643
War Office, [229] 1658
Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1653
Brussels International Exhibition — Sick and Wounded Soldiers, [230] 1477
Civil Departments (Employment of Soldiers), Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1994
Criminal Law — Delay of Justice — Winter Assizes, [228] 625
Fine Arts, Motion for an Address, [229] 299
Game Laws Amendment, 2R. [228] 1815
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [227] 1644, 1648, 1649
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 800

[*cont.*

Elcho, Lord—*cont.*
London Municipal Government, Res. [229] 1784, 1819
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 93
Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, Res. [228] 1249
Metropolitan Improvements Models, [228] 350
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [228] 1812
Railway Accident—John Chiddy, Reward to, [231] 712
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 132
Royal Titles Act—The Proclamation, [228] 1777, 1778;—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 436, 438
Schomberg, Duke of—Pension—Commutation, Res. [231] 758
South-Eastern Railway, 2R. [228] 59
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 848
Supply—British Museum, [231] 263, 265
Ways and Means—Report, Res. [231] 758

Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote) Bill

(*Mr. Heygate, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Wheelhouse, Mr. Morley*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 46]
Order for 2R. read *May* 17, [229] 913; after short debate, further proceeding on 2R. adjourned
Further proceeding on 2R. resumed *June* 9, 1662
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Mundella*); Question put; A. 33, N. 41; M. 8
Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" Moved, "That the House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Rowley Hill*); after short debate, Question put; A. 21, N. 47; M. 26
Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Ramsay*); Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Electoral County Boards (Ireland) Bill

(*Captain Nolan, Mr. O'Clery, Mr. Fay*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 8]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 23, [227] 765
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Kavanagh*); after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c." put, and negatived
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Elementary Education Act, 1870

Miscellaneous Questions

Armley National School, Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 18, [230] 1527
Briston School District, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 28, [228] 696

Elementary Education Act (1870)—cont.
Cardiff School Board, Question, Colonel Stuart; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 17, [228] 171; Question, Mr. Birley; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 4, [229] 47; Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, Viscount Sandon *August* 7, [231] 703
Clause 6—Compulsory Attendance, Questions, Mr. Sandford, Mr. Isaac; Answers, Viscount Sandon *May* 25, [229] 1188;—*Case of George Beavis*, Questions, Mr. Boord; Answers, Viscount Sandon, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 11, [227] 227
"*Godless Education,*" Question, Mr. Maurice Brooks; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 20, [228] 267
London Board Schools—Attendance, Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 22, [229] 1036;—*The Returns*, Question, Major Jervis; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 8, [229] 206
Poor Law Relief, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 6, [227] 1417
Public Elementary Schools, Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 2, [227] 1204
Pupil Teachers, Question, Mr. Briggs; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 30, [228] 877
School Board Prosecutions, Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Feb* 18, [227] 480
School Board Schools—Religious Instruction, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Feb* 18, [227] 483
School Board Teachers, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 31, [228] 966
School Boards—Returns, Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 1, [229] 1520;—*Rules* 12 *and* 14, Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 15, 1895
Science in Elementary Schools, Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 7, [228] 1405
Transfer of Wrentham School, Question, Mr. Colman; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 6, [227] 1414

Parl. Papers—

Cost, 1874-5	284
London School Board Accommodation	265
Building and Maintenance	208
Religious Instruction	209
Expenditure	[1463]
Report	[1513]

Elementary Education Act (1870)—*School Boards—Primary Education*

Moved for, Return of Civil Parishes (exclusive of London and municipal boroughs) under School Boards on the 1st of January, 1876, specifying those where compulsory education has been enforced (*The Earl De La Warr*) *May* 5, [229] 96; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to
Return of Civil Parishes (exclusive of London and municipal boroughs) under School Boards on the 1st of January 1876, specifying those

[*cont.*

Elementary Education Act (1870)—*School Boards —Primary Education*—cont.
where compulsory education has been enforced, and also specifying the number and names of School Boards which have made no provision for religious instruction within the schools under their management (*The Earl De La Warr*) ordered

Elementary Education Bill
(*Viscount Sandon, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Orders of the Day postponed (*Mr. Disraeli*)
Motion for Leave (*Viscount Sandon*) *May* 18,
229] 929; after debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 155]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" . *June* 15, 1897
Amendt to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the recommendations contained in the recent Report of the Factory and Workshops Acts Commission, relating to the enforcement of the attendance of children at school, should be introduced in any measure for improving the elementary education of the people" (*Mr. Mundella*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth*); after further short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned
Poor Educational Districts, Questions, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Viscount Sandon *May* 25, 1191
School Fees, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, . Viscount Sandon *June* 1, 1517
230] Debate resumed *June* 19, 15; after long debate, Question put; A. 309, N. 163; M. 146
Division List, A. and N. 96
On Question, "That the Bill be now read 2°?" after short debate, Question put; A. 356, N. 78; M. 278; Bill read 2°
The Amendments, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; . Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 7, 1141
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 10, 1186
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the principle of universal compulsion in Education cannot be applied without great injustice, unless provision be made for placing public Elementary Schools under public management" (*Mr. Richard*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 317, N. 99; M. 218
. Division List, A. and N. 1268
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.
. Committee—R.P. *July* 11, 1283
. Committee—R.P. *July* 13, 1399
. Committee—R.P. *July* 14, 1435
. Committee—R.P. *July* 17, 1495
. Committee—R.P. *July* 18, 1528
. *Certificated Children—Clause* 14, Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 20, 1630

Elementary Education Bill—cont.
230] Committee—R.P. *July* 20, 1640
. Committee—R.P. *July* 21, 1700
. Committee—R.P. *July* 24, 1822
. Committee—R.P. *July* 25, 1890
. Committee—R.P. *July* 27, 1976
231] Committee—R.P. *July* 28, 9 [Bill 277]
. Committee; Report *July* 29, 60
. Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" *August* 3, 437
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, principles have been introduced into this Bill since its Second Reading which were not then either mentioned to or contemplated by the House, which tend to disturb the basis on which Elementary Education now rests, to impede the formation of new schools, to introduce discord and confusion into the Election of School Boards, and to place the management of schools in the hands of persons who neither contribute to their support nor are elected by the ratepayers" (*The Marquess of Hartington*) *v.*; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 182, N. 120; M. 62
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered; Amendts. made
Amendt. in page 6, line 17, after "pay," to insert "If the parent of any child who is resident in the district of a School Board is unable, by reason of poverty, to pay the fees of such child at a public elementary school, or any part of such fee, and if the School Board fails to make regulations, under Clauses twenty-five and seventy-four of the Elementary Education Act of 1870 for the payment of the same, it shall be the duty of the Guardians, if satisfied of such inability, to pay the same in accordance with the provisions of this section" (*Lord Robert Montagu*); Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after long debate, Debate adjourned
. Debate resumed *August* 4, 518; after long debate, further proceeding adjourned
. Further Proceedings resumed *August* 4, 551; Amendts. made
Lords Amendts. [Bill 295]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *August* 7
. Read 2ª, after debate *August* 8, 775 (No. 204)
. Committee *August* 10, 937
Report* *August* 11 (No. 226)
Read 3ª* *August* 12
c. Lords Amendts. considered, and agreed to . *August* 14, 1222
l. Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 79]

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Dixon, Mr. Mundella, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Trevelyan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 14]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 5, [228] 1251
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Sandford*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 160, N. 281; M. 121
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

[*cont.*

Elementary Education (Application for School Board) Bill
(*Mr. Heygate, Mr. Pell, Mr. W. Stanhope, Mr. Sampson Lloyd*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 16]
2R. [Dropped]

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Cardiff) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 23 (No. 142)
Read 2ª* *June* 27
Committee*; Report *July* 6
Read 3ª* *July* 7
c. Read 1°* (*Viscount Sandon*) *July* 10 [Bill 243]
Read 2°* *July* 13
Committee*; Report *July* 21
Read 3°* *July* 24
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cxcvii]

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Hailsham, &c.) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *May* 30 (No. 101)
Read 2ª* *June* 16
Committee* *June* 2
Report* *June* 27
Read 3ª* *June* 29
c. Read 1°* (*Viscount Sandon*) *July* 3 [Bill 223]
Read 2°* *July* 6
Committee*; Report *July* 17
Read 3°* *July* 18
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cliii]

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Hornsey) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Cadogan*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 1 (No. 104)
Read 2ª* *June* 20
Committee*; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª* *June* 30
c. Read 1°* (*Viscount Sandon*) *July* 3 [Bill 224]
Read 2°* *July* 6
Committee*; Report *July* 17
Read 3°* *July* 18
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cliv]

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *May* 30 (No. 100)
Read 2ª* *June* 16
Committee*; Report *June* 26
Read 3ª* *June* 27
c. Read 1°* (*Viscount Sandon*) *July* 3 [Bill 221]
Read 2°* *July* 7
Question, Explanation, Lord Francis Hervey; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 10, [230] 1178

[*cont.*

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill—cont.
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 9, [231] 932; debate adjourned
Debate resumed *August* 12, [230] 1185
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Baring*) *v.*; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Charley*) [The Motion was not seconded]
Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to; Committee; Report; read 3°
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxix]

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Tolleshunt Major) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Derby*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 13 (No. 114)
Read 2ª* *June* 20
Committee* *June* 29
Report* *June* 30
Read 3ª* *July* 3
c. Read 1°* (*Viscount Sandon*) *July* 6 [Bill 238]
Read 2°* *July* 10
Committee*; Report *July* 18
Read 3°* *July* 20
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clx]

ELLESMERE, Earl of
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 13

ELLICE, Mr. E., *St. Andrews*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 33
Public Works Loan Commissioners — Road Trusts (Scotland), [230] 872

ELLIOT, Sir G., *Durham, N.*
Egypt—Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Mission, Res. [231] 650
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 34, [230] 1514
Supply—Report—Suez Canal—Modification of Dues, [228] 1572

ELLIOT, Mr. G. W., *Northallerton*
Railways, Royal Commission on, [227] 551
United States—The "Alabama" Claims, [228] 1481

ELPHINSTONE, Lord
Mercantile Marine — Training Ships, [227] 1787, 1789
Navy—Chain Cables and Anchors, [227] 547
Flag Rank, Promotion to, [229] 1257
Navy—Iron-clads, Motion for Returns, [227] 1861

ELPHINSTONE, Sir J. D. H., *Portsmouth*
Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 448, 449
Parliament — Leitrim County Election — Captain O'Beirne, [230] 181

Elver Fishing Bill
(*Mr. Monk, Mr. Price*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 22 [Bill 162]
Read 2° * *June* 29
Committee * ; Report *July* 3 [Bill 225]
Considered * *July* 6
Read 3° * *July* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Boyle*) *July* 10 (No. 164)
Read 2ª * *July* 14
Committee * ; Report *July* 20
Read 3ª * *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 34]

Ely, Bishop of
University of Oxford, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 943

Emly, Lord
Cattle Disease (Ireland), 2R. [231] 567
Cattle Diseases (England and Ireland)—Privy Council Regulations, [227] 129
Egypt — Khedive, The, and the New Legal Tribunals, [231] 964
National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, [229] 359, 360
Poor Law Rating (Ireland), 2R. [231] 499

Emlyn, Viscount, *Carmarthen*
Army—Militia Adjutants, [227] 1767
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 2016

Employers and Workmen Act (1875) Extension Bill
(*Mr. Burt, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Gourley*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 23]
2R. [Dropped]

Employers Liability for Injury Bill
(*Mr. Macdonald, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Bass*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 15]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 24, [229] 1154
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Rodwell*) ; after further short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn ; Bill withdrawn

Employers Liability for Injuries to their Servants—See title *Master and Servant Laws*

Endowed Schools Act, 1869
Moved, That there be laid before the House, Return made out county by county, with in each case a proximate estimate of the annual value of the endowments, of (1) the number of schemes finally approved and in force in England and Wales under the Endowed Schools Act of 1869 ; of (2) the number of schemes published by the Endowed Schools Commissioners and the Charity Commissioners but not yet finally approved ; and (3) educational endowments not included in Nos. 1 and 2 but within the provisions of the said Act, distinguishing those to which section 3 of the Endowed Schools Act, 1873, applies, in continuation of the Return ordered the 22nd of June 1875" (*The Earl Fortescue*) *June* 26, [230] 388 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to (*Parl. P.* 224)

Enfield, Viscount
Army—Militia, Paymasters in the, [230] 848
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, Traffic at, [227] 548
Sweden—Stockholm, Episcopal Church at, [229] 1885

English Channel, The
Channel Tunnel Scheme, Question, Mr. Bromley-Davenport ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 12, [229] 1665
The Straits Tunnel, Questions, Mr. Whalley ; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 4, [230] 947

Epping Forest Bill
(*Lord Henry Lennox, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 11 [Bill 66]
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *Feb* 28, [227] 1105
And, on *Feb* 29, Committee nominated as follows : — Mr. Goldney (Chairman), Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Kinnaird ; Mr. Ellice, Mr. Neville-Grenville nominated by the Committee of Selection
Report of Select Comm. *Mar* 3
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *Mar* 7
Read 3° * *Mar* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *Mar* 9 (No. 24)
Read 2ª * *Mar* 10
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 13
Read 3ª * *Mar* 14
Royal Assent *Mar* 17 [39 *Vict.* c. 3]

Epping Forest—The Forest Commissioners' Scheme
Question, Mr. Cowper-Temple ; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 20, [230] 1624

Erne Lough and River Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 187]
Read 2° *, and committed to the Select Committee on the Arklow Harbour Improvement Bill *July* 11
Report of Select Comm. *July* 20
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read ; Moved, "That Mr. Deputy Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 21, [230] 1763
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 8, N. 53 ; M. 45
Original Question put, and agreed to ; Committee ; Report
Read 3° * *July* 24
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *July* 25 (No. 189)
Read 2ª *August* 7, [231] 688
Report * *August* 8
Committee * ; Report *August* 9
Read 3ª * *August* 10
Royal Assent *Aug* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxxvii]

[*cont.*

Erne Lough and River [*Expenses of Works*]
c. Considered in Committee *July* 13, [230] 1426; a Resolution agreed to

ERRINGTON, Mr. G., *Longford Co.*
Africa (West Coast of)—Native Labourers—African Mail Steamers, [231] 690
Army—Militia Regiments, Surgeons of, [229] 919
Mobilization—Longford Rifle Militia, [231] 691
Coolies—Réunion, Island of, [228] 478
Foreshores—Balbriggan Foreshore, [230] 1045
Ireland—Upper Shannon, [230] 1171;—Ballyconnell Canal, [229] 1035
Medical Degrees—"Conjoint Examinations," [227] 1709
Naval Surgeons—Sir Gilbert Blane's Bequest, [230] 1043
Queen's College (Ireland), [229] 487
Saint Vincent (Treatment of Coolies), Motion for an Address, [227] 2073
Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [231] 277
Turkey—Loans of 1854 and 1871, [231] 966
West Indies—St. Vincent, Island of, [229] 365

ESLINGTON, Lord, *Northumberland, S.*
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1535
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 840
Local Light Dues (Reduction), Comm. [229] 1963
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1010
Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. Amendt. [227] 1820
Merchant Service Officers, Res. [229] 801
227] Merchant Shipping, 2R. 456
228] Comm. 530; *cl.* 3, 548, 551, 649, 657;
. Amendt. 884, 901; *cl.* 5, 1154, 1156;
. Amendt. 1158, 1159; *cl.* 11, 1371; *cl.* 13,
. 1373; Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 14, 1375; *cl.* 15,
. 1593; Amendt. 1613; Amendt. 1615; *cl.* 16,
. 1792; *cl.* 18, 1805, 1808; *cl.* 19, 1883;
. *cl.* 24, 1913; *cl.* 27, 1917; *add. cl.* 1924,
. 1938
229] 55, 65, 66, 67, 92, 211, 224; Consid. *add.*
. *cl.* 1060, 1061; *cl.* 11, 1068; *cl.* 20, 1078;
. 3R. 1335
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1091
Parliament—Public Business, [228] 1330; [229] 492
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1766; *add. cl.* 1779
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1758

European Assurance Society Arbitration
Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 22, [229] 1038

EVANS, Mr. T. W., *Derbyshire, S.*
Elementary Education, 2R. [229] 1926; Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1292; *cl.* 6, 1409; *cl.* 33, 1511; *add. cl.* 1902, 1905
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 552
Prisons, 2R. [230] 295

EVERSLEY, Viscount
Commons, Report, *cl.* 19, [230] 1518

EWING, Mr. A. Orr, *Dumbartonshire*
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [230] 196, 197, 201
Burghs and Populous Places (Scotland) Gas Supply, 2R. [228] 7
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1358
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 29
Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1516
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1620
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1387
Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1877
Poor Law (Scotland), Comm. [230] 525
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [228] 1810, 1812; *cl.* 11, 1813

Exchequer Bonds (£4,080,000) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Resolutions [Feb 24] reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 25 [Bill 89]
Read 2°* *Feb* 28
Committee*—R.P. *Mar* 2
227] Committee; Report *Mar* 3, 1399
. Read 3°, after debate *Mar* 6, 1420
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 6
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 7
Personal Explanation, Earl Granville; Reply,
. The Earl of Derby *Mar* 7, 1499
Royal Assent *Mar* 9 [39 *Vict.* c. 1]

EXCHEQUER, CHANCELLOR of the (*see* CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER)

EXETER, Bishop of
Bishopric of Truro, 2R. [231] 670
Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 646
Endowed Schools Commissioners, Motion for Returns, [230] 390
Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 755; Comm. [230] 938
University of Oxford, Comm. [228] 926; *cl.* 16, 960

Exhausted Parish Lands Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt*)
c. Ordered* *July* 13
Read 1°* *July* 14 [Bill 252]
Read 2°* *July* 17
Committee*; Report *July* 20
Read 3°* *July* 21
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl Jersey*) *July* 24 (No. 186)
Read 2ª* *August* 4
Committee* *August* 8
Report* *August* 9
Read 3ª* *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 62]

Exhibition Commissioners of 1851—The Financial Position
Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 22, [230] 254

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *August* 1 [Bill 281]
Read 2°* *August* 4
Committee; Report *August* 9, [231] 879
Considered*; read 3° *August* 10
l. Read 1ª* (*Marquess of Salisbury*) *August* 11 (No. 229)
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *August* 12
Read 3ª* *August* 14
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 69]

Explosive Substances Act, 1875
Annual Report, 1875 . . *P.P.* [1502]
Explosion at Hamilton, Question, Mr. Ramsay; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 22, [230] 258
Explosion of Dynamite in South Wales, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 28, [228] 1831; *May* 25, [229] 1190
Report thereon . . . . *P.P.* [1601]
Railway Companies' Bye-Laws, Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 30, [228] 879

Extradition
Joint Stock Companies Act—Arrest of an Official Liquidator at Hamburg, Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 18, [229] 926
Treaty with France—Case of Nadal, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 31, [231] 116

Extradition Treaties
Question, Colonel Egerton Leigh; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 22, [227] 673
[See title *United States*]

Factory and Workshop Acts
Bleachworks and Dyeworks, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 3, [228] 1098
Factory and Workshops Commission—The Report, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 22, [228] 618
Report and Appendix . . . [1443
Legislation, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 27, [228] 1761; Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 1, [229] 1520

Factory and Workshop Acts
Moved, "That, in any measure for the consolidation and amendment of the Factory and Workshop Acts, it is desirable, in the interests alike of employers and employed, that all trades and manufactures employing the same class of labour should be placed upon the same footing and under the same protective and restrictive provisions" (*Mr. Tennant*) *July* 4, [230] 985
[House counted out]
Question, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Answer, Mr. Tennant *August* 4, [231] 550; Motion postponed

Fawcett, Mr. H., *Hackney*
227] Commons, 2R. 537
229] Comm. Amendt. 1219, 1251, 1383, 1385; *cl.* 2, 1393; Amendt. 1394; *cl.* 8, 1526, 1529; *cl.* 12, 1534; *cl.* 18, 1559; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1561; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1563, 1565; *add. cl.* 1570, 1574, 1576
230] Consid. 131, 132, 136; Amendt. 139
Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. Amendt [227] 1278
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 741
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Amendt. [231] 1010, 1054
Education Department—Pupil Teachers, [231] 1069
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1454
229] Elementary Education, 2R. 1959
230] Comm. *cl.* 4, 1295; *cl.* 6, 1402; *cl.* 11, 1441; *add. cl.* 1541, 1875, 1907; Amendt. 1908, 1909
231] 17; Consid. *cl.* 14, Motion for reporting Progress, 480, 524, 528, 536; Amendt. 545, 549
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. Amendt. [227] 901
India—Indian Finance—Exchanges, The, [231] 118
Indian Tariff Act, 1875, [227] 1714; [228] 1483; [229] 50;—Despatches, [230] 7
India—Bengal Famine, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1873
Indian Legislation, 2R. [227] 467
Law and Justice—Wilberforce, Mr., Case of, Res. [228] 2017
Metropolis — Indian and Colonial Museum, [230] 256, 617, 618, 1398; [231] 974
New Forest—Stoneycross Inclosure, [231] 702
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [228] 1184, 1330, 1331; [229] 107; [231] 123; Res. 711
Plumstead and Wormholt Commons, Res. [231] 831
Public Works Loans, Comm. Amendt. [230] 960, 981
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1593; Amendt. 1601
Royal Titles, 3R. [228] 512; Notice of Motion, 563
Royal Titles—The Proclamation, [228] 1574, 1575, 1629, 1632, 1633; Motion for Adjournment, 1766, 1778
Savings Banks and Friendly Societies—Deficiencies, [228] 271
Supply—Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company, [228] 337
Police, County and Borough, [228] 337
Report, Motion for Adjournment, [227] 999
Royal Palaces, Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 251
Toll Bridges (River Thames), [230] 1628
Turkey—Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [231] 876
Eastern Question, [230] 880;—Papers, 946
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1711

Fay, Mr. C. J., *Cavan Co.*
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 787
Irish Church Temporalities, Motion for Returns, [228] 766

[*cont.*

FAY, Mr. C. J.—*cont.*
Irish Church Temporalities Commission—Church Lands, [227] 1292, 1293
Irish Churchyards, [229] 368
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 270
Magistrates (Ireland)—Orange Meeting, Speech at, [229] 165
Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 20
Supply—Report, [228] 688

FEVERSHAM, Earl of
Dover Harbour, Petition, [229] 1109
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 1078

FIELDEN, Mr. J., *Yorkshire, W.R., E. Div.*
Municipal Officers Superannuation (No. 2), 2R. Amendt. [227] 324; Comm. Amendt. 1603
South Eastern Railway, 2R. [227] 1703

Fiji
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies or extracts of any other correspondence or documents explaining the present condition of the colony of Fiji" (*The Viscount Canterbury*) *July* 21, [230] 1689; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Fiji Islands, The
Rumoured Disturbances, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 10, [230] 1174
The Epidemic, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 28, [227] 1023; Questions, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 1, [231] 255 *P.P.* 399, 408
The Land Question, Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 12, [231] 1157
The Papers, Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 27, [230] 1967
Correspondence . . . . . *P.P.* [1404]
Letter of Secretary of State . 408

Fine Arts—The Continental States
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to cause to be laid before Parliament, a Copy of a late Report on the direction of the Fine Arts in France, made by M. Edouard Charton to the French Ministry of Public Instruction; and also praying that She will be graciously pleased to cause Her Representatives at the European Courts to report on the present attitude of the State towards the Fine Arts in the various Countries of Europe" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *May* 9, [229] 265
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House there is no ground for imputing to the Royal Academy neglect in adopting reforms with the view to promote the active development of higher Art education in England" (*Mr. William Cartwright*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Fisheries (England)—Rye Bay
Question, Mr. Stewart Hardy; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 22, [230] 253

FITZMAURICE, Lord E. G., *Calne*
Commons, Comm. [229] 1232, 1380, 1383; *cl.* 2, 1390, 1396; *cl.* 8, 1528; *cl.* 12, 1532; *cl.* 18, 1558; *add. cl.* 1566; Consid. Amendt. [230] 136; Amendt. 137
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 7, [230] 1413, 1414; *add. cl.* 1535, 1542, 1650, 1651, 1710; Consid. *cl.* 15, [231] 553
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 130
Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Insurrection in, Res. [231] *156, 210
University of Cambridge, Leave, [229] 834; 2R. [230] 1088

FLOYER, Mr. J., *Dorsetshire*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 997
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 14, [230] 1456
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1767
Valuation of Property, Leave, [227] 249

FOLKESTONE, Viscount, *Wilts, S.*
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. Amendt. [228] 1671

FORBES, Lord
University of Oxford, Comm. [228] 935

Foreign Decorations
Question, Observations, Lord Houghton; Reply, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *May* 26, [229] 1263; Question, Observations, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Reply, The Earl of Derby *May* 30, 1414

Foreshores—Balbriggan Foreshore
Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 6, [230] 1045

Forfeiture Relief Bill
(*Mr. Marten, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Gregory*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 19 [Bill 259]
Read 2° * *July* 31
Committee *; Report *August* 2
Considered * *August* 4
Considered *; read 3° *August* 7
l. Read 1ᵃ * (*E. Limerick*) *August* 8 (No. 210)
Order for 2R. discharged, after short debate, *August* 10, [231] 963

FORSTER, Sir C., *Walsall*
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Privilege—Monastic and Conventual Institutions, [228] 1318, 1319
Public Petitions—Grants of Money, [230] 249
Vaccination Acts—Boards of Guardians, [230] 945

Forster, Right Hon. W. E., *Bradford*
Barbadoes—Riots, The, [228] 1763
Social and Political Condition, [231] 55
Bishopric of Truro, Consid. [231] 72
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2045
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [231] 929; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1148; *add. cl.* 1151; Amendt. 1152
Education—Queen's Speech, [228] 620
Teachers of Public Elementary Schools, [231] 258
Education Code—Subjects, Choice of, Res. [227] 1808
Education Department—Keynsham British School, [229] 1895; [231] 256, 257
Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Report, [230] 11
229] Elementary Education, Leave, 949, 952, 953
230] 2R. 70, 100; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1288; *cl.* 4, 1289, 1292, 1295, 1296; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1298, 1300; *cl.* 6, 1400, 1401, 1406; Amendt. 1408, 1412; *cl.* 7, 1413, 1414; Amendt. 1415, 1416, 1417; *cl.* 11, 1419, 1420, 1444, 1446; *cl.* 12, 1450, 1452; *cl.* 16, 1496; *cl.* 20, 1499; Amendt. 1500; *cl.* 26, 1502; *cl.* 27, 1506; *cl.* 29, 1509; *cl.* 34, 1511; Postponed *cl.* 8, 1529; *cl.* 9, 1531; *add.cl.* 1535, 1536, 1538, 1539, 1541, 1542, 1544, 1545, 1551, 1641, 1650, 1651, 1652, 1661, 1668, 1701, 1702, 1706, 1872; Amendt. 1874, 1875; Amendt. 1890, 1891, 1900, 1902, 1903; Amendt. 1905; Amendt. 1906; Amendt. 1907, 1909, 1910, 1989; Amendt. 2001, 2016
231] 18, 21, 23, 62, 65; Schedule 1, 68, 69; Report, 72; Consid. 450, 464; *add. cl.* 472; *cl.* 8, 474; *cl.* 14, 476, 478, 481; Motion for Adjournment, 488, 489, 492, 524; Amendt. 525, 544, 547, 548; Amendt. 551; 3R. 609
Elementary Education Act, 1870 — School Board Prosecutions, [227] 481
Elementary Education Bill—Poor Educational Districts, [229] 1192;—The Amendments, [230] 1141
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1181
Fiji Papers, [230] 1967
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 710, 886, 888
228] Merchant Shipping, Comm. 537; *cl.* 3, 551, 671, 676, 895; *cl.* 14, 1585, 1586; *cl.* 15, 1600, 1610, 1612; *cl.* 16, 1792; *add. cl.* 1929
229] 211, 217, 235; Consid. *cl.* 11, 1068, 1069, 1070; *cl.* 18, 1072
Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 994
Parliament—Business of the House, [231] 977
Public Business, Arrangement of, [227] 1126; [229] 107; [230] 129, 130, 621; [231] 123, 126, 550
Parliament—Referees on Private Bills, Nomination of Select Committee, [227] 1496
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 419, 427
Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 420; 2R. 1752; Comm. [228] 143, 145, 147, 152; *cl.* 1, 281, 302, 303
Slave Trade (East Africa), Res. [228] 1227
Suez Canal Company—Concession and Firman, [227] 137
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, [227] 296

[*cont.*

Forster, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Turkey—Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [230] 424, 1180, 1182; Motion for Adjournment, 1183; [231] 1097, 1100, 1140
Salonica Murders—Correspondence, [230] 1822
Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Insurrection in, Res. [231] 225
Turkey and Greece — Circassians, Proposed Settlement of, [231] 121

Forsyth, Mr. W., *Marylebone*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 983, 1144
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1226
Army Estimates, Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1649
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 214
Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 116
Cheques on Bankers, Leave, [227] 320
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1216
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 8, [230] 1529; *add. cl.* 1703, 1891
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1164
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 832; [230] 6
India—Bengal, Office of Advocate General, [228] 68
Indian Budget, [228] 1404
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 893
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 584
Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 491
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 283, 335
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1336
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1317
Turkey—Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [231] 1091
Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Insurrection in, Res. [231] 145
University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1066
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1658, 1741

Fortescue, Earl
Africa, West Coast of—Exchange of Territory, [227] 396
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [230] 1428
Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment, 2R. [231] 1065, 1067, 1068
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 118
Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 812; Comm. *cl.* 10, 940; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 941; *cl.* 15, 942; *cl.* 18, 944
Endowed Schools Commissioners, Motion for Returns, [230] 388
Gas Light and Coke Company, 2R. [230] 231; Report, 1130
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. [230] 1471; *add. cl.* 1472

France and the United States
Reported Commercial Treaty, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 31, [231] 116
Sugar Convention, 1875, Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 30, [230] 737
Correspondence . . . . . [1527]

FRASER, Sir W. A., *Kidderminster*
Army—Militia Adjutants, [227] 1768
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 965
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1651
Civil Departments (Employment of Soldiers), Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1997
Criminal Law—Metropolitan Police—Case of Mr. Palmer, [228] 1462
Prison Diet, [228] 877
Dover Harbour, [227] 136
Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London), Explanation, [230] 1180
Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, Res. [228] 1249
Metropolis (Parochial System), Res. [227] 303, 314
Metropolitan Fire Brigade, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 365
Open Spaces (Metropolitan District), Comm. [228] 428
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 589
Order—Debates in the House of Lords, Reference to, [229] 1627
Privilege—Public Petitions—Personal Explanation, [229] 586
Parliament—Privilege—Political Committee of the Reform Club, Res. [229] 1669, 1671, 1679
Parliament—Public Petitions from a Foreign Town—Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1418
Parliament—Public Petitions—Monastic and Conventual Institutions, Motion for Adjournment, [228] 1402
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 110; *cl.* 1, 307
Royal Titles—The Proclamation, [228] 1775
Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 338
Metropolitan Police, [228] 391
Mint, including Coinage, [227] 522

Free Libraries and Museums Bill
(*Mr. Mundella, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Cowper-Temple*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 35]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 3

FRENCH, Hon. C., *Roscommon*
Convict Prisons (Ireland), [230] 736
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 788

FRESHFIELD, Mr. C. K., *Dover*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—1st Surrey Militia Regiment, [230] 1965
Dover Harbour, [231] 691
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1736

Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 30 [Bill 177]
Read 2° *June* 8, [229] 1597
Committee *; Report *June* 22
Considered * *June* 27
Read 3° * *June* 28
Lords Amendts. [Bill 249]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 29
[*cont.*

Friendly Societies Act (1875) *Amendment Bill*—cont.
Read 2ª * *July* 4 (No. 149)
Committee * *July* 7
Report * *July* 10
Read 3ª * *July* 11
Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 32]

Friendly Societies Act, 1875—*Certificates of Deaths*
Question, Mr. Waddy; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 21, [227] 558; Question, Mr. Ashbury; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 16, [228] 71; Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 3, 1096; Question, Mr. W. Holms; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 6, 1325

Friendly Societies Act — Registration Clause
Question, Mr. Earp; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 5, [229] 103

GALWAY, Viscount, *Retford (East)*
Army—Yeomanry Trumpeters and Bands, [230] 247

Game Laws Amendment (Scotland) Bill
(*Lord Elcho, Sir Graham Montgomery*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 7 [Bill 123]
2R., Debate adjourned *April* 27, [228] 1815
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

Game Laws (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Lagan, Sir William Stirling Maxwell, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. John Maitland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 3]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 8, [227] 1606
After debate, Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Lord Elcho*), 1644; after further debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 172, N. 150; M. 22
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn * *July* 26

GARDNER, Mr. J. T. Agg-, *Cheltenham*
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1780

GARNIER, Mr. J. CARPENTER-, *Devon, S.*
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1769

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill
[H.L.] (*The Lord Elphinstone*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 7 (No. 55)
Read 2ª * *May* 4
Committee * *May* 12
Report * *May* 15
Read 3ª * *May* 16
c. Read 1° * *May* 18 [Bill 158]
Read 2° * *May* 22
Committee *; Report *June* 1
Read 3° * *June* 12
l. Royal Assent *June* 27 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 41]

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (Chapel-en-le-Frith, &c.) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *April* 28 (No. 59)
Read 2ª * *May* 5
Committee * *May* 29
Report * *May* 30
Read 3ª * *June* 1
c. Read 1° * *June* 15 [Bill 195]
Read 2° * *June* 19
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3° * *June* 30
l. Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 92]

Gas Companies Act—Gas Referees
Question, Colonel Makins; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 23, [229] 1110

Gas Light and Coke Company Bill
230] *l.* Read 2ª, after short debate, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection *June* 22, 227
Question, The Earl of Camperdown; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *June* 29, 611
Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments; Observations, Lord Redesdale; short debate thereon *July* 7, 1128
Committee; Report, after short debate *July* 27, 1943
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *August* 3, [231] 367
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("upon this day three months") (*The Earl of Camperdown*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now") &c.; Cont. 34, Not-Cont. 21; M. 13; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2ª

Gas (Metropolis)—Price of
Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *August* 10, [231] 969

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Lerwick) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Steward*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 16 (No. 122)
Read 2ª * *June* 23
Committee * *July* 3
Report * *July* 4
Read 3ª * *July* 6
c. Read 1° * (*The Lord Advocate*) *July* 7
Read 2° * *July* 10 [Bill 242]
Committee *; Report *July* 18
Read 3° * *July* 20
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clxiii]

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Orders Confirmation (Paisley) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Steward*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 13 (No. 112)
Read 2ª * *June* 20
Committee * *June* 29
Report * *June* 30
Read 3ª * *July* 3
c. Read 1° * (*The Lord Advocate*) *July* 6
Read 2° * *July* 10 [Bill 235]
Committee *; Report *July* 18
Read 3° * *July* 20
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clvii]

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Orders Confirmation (Perth) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Steward*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 13 (No. 113)
Read 2ª * *June* 20
Committee * *June* 29
Report * *June* 30
Read 3ª * *July* 3
c. Read 1° * (*The Lord Advocate*) *July* 6
Read 2° * *July* 10 [Bill 236]
Committee *; Report *July* 18
Read 3° * *July* 20
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clviii]

General School of Law Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Selborne*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 3 (No. 48)
Read 2ª, and committed to the Committee on Inns of Court Bill *May* 1
Committee; Report, after short debate *May* 15, [229] 587
Read 3ª * *May* 29

Germany — Prince Bismarck and Count Arnim
Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 30, [228] 875

Gibraltar—Aliens
Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 14, [230] 1434

GIBSON, Mr. E., *Dublin University*
Army—Lieutenant Walker, Case of, [231] 971
Medical Reports, [231] 254
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 736, 737
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 854
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [230] 225
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 697
Municipal Privileges (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* Amendt. [231] 661; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 662; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 663, 664
Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [229] 9
Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [231] 278
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 356, 359

Gilpin, Colonel Sir R. T., *Bedfordshire*
Army—Militia Adjutants, [227] 1767
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 944, 959

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., *Greenwich*
City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1144, 1149
Consolidated Fund, 3R. [227] 1438
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 986, 987
Egypt—Suez Canal Shares—Representation and Management, [229] 1605
Exchequer Bonds, Comm. *cl.* 2, [227] 1401; 3R. 1423
Fine Arts, Motion for an Address, [229] 294
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 102
  Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1975, 1976
Parliament — Public Petitions from a Foreign Town — Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1413, 1416
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 422
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 570
227] Royal Titles, 2R. 1733, 1736
228] Comm. 93, 154; *cl.* 1, 289, 298, 299, 301, 324, 332; 3R. 484, 486, 494, 495
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1340
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, [227] 291; Res. 584
Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Insurrection in, Res. [231] 172, 204, 205, 207
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1741, 1752, 1754

Goldney, Mr. G., *Chippenham*
City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1148
227] Commons, 2R. 541
229] Comm. 1227, 1384; *cl.* 2, 1388; *cl.* 8, 1526, 1531; *cl.* 12, 1535; *cl.* 18, 1559
230] Consid. 134, 135
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Acts 1871 and 1872, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 371
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1837
Highway Boards, [228] 967
Metropolis (Parochial System), Res. [227] 308
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [227] 471
Prisons, 2R. [230] 308
Railways—Accident on the Great Western at Bourton, [231] 576
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 591

Goldsmid, Sir F. H., *Reading*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 1160
Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 499

Goldsmid Mr. J., *Rochester*
Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1037
Drugging of Animals, 2R. [227] 1490
Henwood, Mr. C., Petition of, Res. [227] 1404; [228] 344
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 6, Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 1160
Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, Res. [228] 1250
National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, Res. [228] 225
Open Spaces (Metropolitan District), Comm. [228] 428
Parliament—Referees on Private Bills, Nomination of Select Committee, [227] 1496
Post Office — Postal Telegraph Department, Res. [228] 172, 224
Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 423; Comm. [228] 133
Spain—War Taxes on British Subjects, [228] 1321
Supply—Charity Commission, [227] 504, 505
  Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 339
  Civil Service Commission, [227] 511
  Criminal Prosecutions, &c. England, [227] 1847
Telegraphs (Money), 2R. [227] 1489
Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [227] 1162, 1163

Gordon, Sir A., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), [227] 1020
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Army List—Her Majesty the Queen, [230] 1626
  Grocery Rations, Issue of, [228] 626
  Localization of the Forces, [229] 1667
  Mobilization of the Forces—Army Estimates, [229] 1420
Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1751, 1764; Comm. 1781
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1458
  Military Education, Establishments for, [229] 1656
  Out-Pensions, [229] 1659
Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 203, 205
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1219
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1632
Inland Revenue—Game Licences, [229] 1419
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 901
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 107, Amendt. [228] 914
Navy—Captain Sulivan, Res. [230] 1319, 1326
Parliament—Strangers, Exclusion of, [230] 1553
Protection to Growing Crops (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1028
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 296

Gordon, Mr. W., *Chelsea*
Metropolis—Thames Embankment, [230] 1042
Metropolitan Railway, 2R. [227] 809
Record Office—Destruction and Sale of the Public Records, [231] 692
Turkey—Guaranteed Loan of 1855, [227] 398
  Loans of 1854 and 1855, [228] 698

Gore, Mr. W. R. Ormsby-, *Leitrim*
- Monastic and Conventual Institutions, Petition, [229] 846

Gorst, Mr. J. E., *Chatham*
- Administration of the Navy, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 452
- Army Estimates—Out-Pensions, [229] 1659
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 7, [230] 1414, 1415; *cl.* 28, 1508; *add. cl.* 2004
- Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 827
- Greenwich Pensioners in Government Employ, [228] 620
- 227] Merchant Shipping, 2R. 435
- 228] Comm. Amendt. 519, 539; *cl.* 3, 660; *cl.* 5, 1154; *cl.* 6, 1368; *cl.* 9, 1370; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 1371; *cl.* 14, 1586; *cl.* 15, 1599, 1618; *cl.* 16, 1801; *add. cl.* 1921, 1924, 1936, 1946
- 229] Amendt. 55; Amendt. 56, 57, 221, 226, 227
- 231] Lords Amendts. 1172, 1179
- Merchant Shipping—Stowage, [228] 1478
- Navy—Engineer Officers and Engine-Room Artificers, [229] 1040, 2013
  - Royal Marines, [228] 1521
- Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [228] 1552
  - Dockyards, &c. [230] 468
- Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 410, 1634, 1985; [230] 9
- Queenborough Harbour, 3R. [229] 1968
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1321, 1327
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1141

Goschen, Right Hon. G. J., *London*
- Administration of the Navy, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 448
- Army—Pay of Soldiers and Marines, [227] 1772
- Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1753
- Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, [227] 1486
- Barbadoes—Riots, The—Governor Hennessy, [229] 156
- Commons, Leave, [227] 197
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 977; *cl.* 8, 1210; *cl.* 9, 1213
- East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [231] 1042
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1993; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 529, 534; 3R. 607
- Exchequer Bonds, Comm. *cl.* 2, [227] 1403
- Iron-clad Navies, British and Foreign, [227] 1908, 1912
- Maritime Contracts, Leave, [227] 161
- Merchant Shipping, 2R. [227] 456; Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 908; *add. cl.* 1945; [229] 71
- Navy—H.M.S. "Thunderer," [230] 1972
  - Royal Marines, [228] 1527
- Navy—Captain Sulivan, Res. [230] 1329
- Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. [230] 175
- Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, [227] 132, 133; Motion for a Paper, 1026, 1052, 1053, 1098
- Navy—"Mistletoe," The, Collision, Report of Court of Inquiry, [228] 1409; Res. 1510
- Navy—Ships of War, Res. [229] 244, 252

[*cont.*

Goschen, Right Hon. G. J.—*cont.*
- Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [228] 1551
  - Coast Guard Service, Naval Reserves, &c. [228] 1553; [229] 256, 257
  - Dockyards, &c. [230] 469
  - Men and Boys, &c. [227] 1929, 1932
  - Miscellaneous Services, [230] 474, 475
  - Scientific Departments, [229] 2020, 2021; [230] 459, 461
  - Seamen and Marines, [228] 1546
  - Steam Machinery, &c. [230] 473
- Parliament—Business of the House, [231] 977
  - Public Business, Arrangement of, [228] 1184; [230] 8, 1974
- Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1676; 3R. [231] 559
- Post Office—Postal Telegraph Department, Res. [228] 210
- Prisons, 2R. [230] 314, 911
- Public Works Loans, Comm. [230] 972
- Suez Canal—Modification of Dues, [228] 1569
- Sugar Convention, 1875—Dutch Chamber, Refusal by the, [228] 73
- Supply—Navy Excess of Expenditure, [228] 342
- Telegraphs (Money), 2R. [227] 1489
- University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1113, 1115, 1119, 1125
- University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1747
- Valuation of Property, Leave, [227] 253
- Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1365, 1366

Gough, Viscount
- National Education (Ireland), Motion for Returns, [230] 392

Goulding, Mr. W., *Cork*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1351

Gourley, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
- Administration of the Navy, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 451
- Coal—Sale by Weight, [227] 816
- Egypt—Egyptian Finance—Mr. Rivers Wilson, [228] 1325
- Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1640
- Local Light Dues (Reduction), Comm. [229] 1963
- Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1826
- Merchant Shipping, Leave, [227] 179; Comm. [228] 527; *cl.* 3, 902; *cl.* 5, 1155; Amendt. 1158; *cl.* 16, 1799; *cl.* 19, 1883; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1918; *add. cl.* 1935; Consid. *add. cl.* [229] 1057; Lords Amendts. Consid. [231] 1173, 1178, 1181
- Navy—Naval Reserve, [231] 818
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys &c. [227] 1941
- Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, [228] 622
- Post Office—Cape of Good Hope Mail Contract, [230] 1173
- Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 307
- Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 833
- United States—Winslow Extradition Case, [229] 44, 45

Gower, Hon. E. F. L., *Bodmin*
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 296
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 630

Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Ormsby Gore, Mr. Mulholland*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 18 [Bill 80]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 18

Grand Jury Presentments, &c. (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Ronayne, Mr. Butt, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 22]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 23, [227] 788
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Kavanagh*); Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 153, N. 181; M. 28
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Grantham, Mr. W., *Surrey, E.*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. [231] 864
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1999
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 370
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 898
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 427
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1323

Granville, Earl
Africa, West Coast of—Exchange of Territory, [227] 385
Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Motion for Returns, [229] 1263
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. [228] 1382
Appeals—Standing Orders, Res. [227] 1201
Barbadoes, Disturbances in, [231] 2
Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 588, 609, 615
Burials in Churchyards, 2R. [229] 1092
Cambridge, University of, [228] 466, 468
Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment, 2R. [231] 1066, 1067
Council of India—Indian Tariff, [228] 925
Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [230] 1464
Dover Harbour, Petition, [229] 1099, 1109
Egypt—Cave, Mr., Mission of, [227] 202
Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 787
Exchequer Bonds—Personal Explanation, [227] 1499, 1503, 1505
Foreign Decorations, [229] 1267
Fugitive Slaves, Reception of—Commons Debate, Personal Explanation, [227] 903, 908
India—Indian Tariff, [227] 2005
  Languages—Indian Civil Service, [230] 1468
Indian Government, Address for Papers, [231] 499
Irish Peerage, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 1905; *cl.* 6, 1906; Report, [229] 201
Mercantile Marine—"Franconia" and "Strathclyde" Collision, Motion for Papers, [231] 1059

[*cont.*

Granville, Earl—*cont.*
Owners of Land (Ireland)—New "Domesday Book," [230] 944
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 16, 21, 23
  Whitsuntide Recess, [229] 1254
Patents for Inventions, 2R. [227] 1945
Primary Education, Motion for Returns, [229] 101
Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 827, 855, 867; Comm. 1057, 1094, 1307; 3R. 1386, 1387
Slave Trade, 1R. [230] 240; Comm. *cl.* 1, 850
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Berlin Memorandum, [230] 417
  Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [230] 1164; [231] 1059
  Eastern Question—The Papers, [230] 1765
  Salonica—Murder of the Consuls, [230] 847
  Second Note of the Three Powers, [229] 1000
  Servia, Declaration of War by, [230] 610
Turkey—Treaties of 1856, Res. [231] 83, 97
Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 759
United States—Extradition Treaty—Winslow, Case of, [229] 33
United States—Extradition, [230] 1617, 1618; —Address for Correspondence, 1768
University of Oxford, 2R. [227] 1700; [228] 599; Comm. 820, 821; *cl.* 4, 936; *cl.* 12, 939; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 940, 946; *cl.* 16, 960, 1306; *cl.* 24, 1310; *cl.* 25, 1314
Wild Fowl Preservation, 3R. [230] 1470

Greece—Collision of the "Agrigento" and "Hylton Castle"
Question, Mr. T. E. Smith; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 13, [229] 1762; *August* 14, [231] 1206

Greene, Mr. E., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Barbadoes—Riots, The—Governor Hennessy, [229] 158
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1468
Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 63; Comm. 1230; *add. cl.* 1711; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 488
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1652
Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1215
Law and Justice—Wilberforce, Mr., Case of, Res. [228] 2021
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1009
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 588
  Leitrim County Election—Captain O'Beirne, [230] 182
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 510
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 600

Gregory, Mr. G. B., *Sussex, E.*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [230] 1156; *cl.* 3, 1160; *cl.* 6, [231] 762, 768; Consid. Amendt. 861, 868; *add. cl.* Amendt. 869, 871, 872

[*cont.*

Gregory, Mr. G. B.—*cont.*
Barristers and Advocates Fees, 2R. [229] 329
Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1924
Cheques on Bankers, Leave, [227] 318
Commons, Comm. [229] 1385; *cl.* 2, 1397; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1524; *cl.* 12, 1534; *cl.* 18, 1560; *cl.* 25, 1564; *add. cl.* 1569, 1570; Consid. [230] 132, 134; Amendt. 140
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 8, [229] 1211
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1409; *cl.* 11, 1419; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 1506; *add. cl.* Amendt. 2009
India—Kirwee, Ex-Chiefs of, [228] 477
Judicature Act, 1873—Official Referees—Fees, [230] 1817
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 896; *cl.* 15, 1612; *add. cl.* 1935; [229] 58; Consid. *cl.* 11, 1071
Metropolis—New Courts of Justice, [229] 34
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1014
Navy—Navigation of Her Majesty's Ships, Res. [228] 1654
Parliament—Acts of—Report of Select Committee, Res. [228] 568, 573, 579
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1598
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 581
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 297
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 847
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1333
  Criminal Prosecutions, &c. England, [227] 1847
University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1111
Unreformed Municipal Corporations (England and Wales), Res. [227] 1154

Grey, Earl
Army—Martini-Henry Rifle, [227] 669
Burials in Churchyards, 2R. [229] 1084
India—Indian Tariff, [227] 2000
Irish Peerage, Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1897
Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 841
United States—Extradition, Address for Correspondence, [230] 1796

Grieve, Mr. J. J., *Greenock*
Court of Session (Scotland)—Returns, [227] 1419; [228] 1624
Criminal Law (Scotland)—"Amelia," Case of the, [227] 1712
France—Sugar Convention, 1875, [230] 737
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [228] 1370; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1617; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1880; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 1885
Merchant Shipping Act—Light Dues, [229] 1971
Merchant Shipping Acts—Unseaworthy Ships, [227] 680
Navy—H.M.S. "Thunderer," [231] 8
Post Office—Provincial Continental Messages, [230] 736
  Telegraph System, [229] 1053
Spain—"Clementina," The, [229] 489
Stamp Act—Marine Policies—"Sassoon v. Harris," [227] 679

Guinness, Sir A. E., *Dublin*
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1179, 1181
Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [227] 468; Consid. *add. cl.* [231] 661; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 662; *cl.* 4, *ib.*; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 663

Gun Licence Act (1870) Amendment Bill
(*Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Mark Stewart*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 26 [Bill 174]
2R. [Dropped]

Gurney, Right Hon. R., *Southampton*
Commons, Consid. [230] 136
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1929
Crossed Cheques, 3R. [231] 1217
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [231] 65
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* Amendt. [228] 1941, 1942
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1728, 1760

Halifax, Viscount
Council of India—Indian Tariff, [228] 921, 925
Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [227] 1198
India—Indian Tariff, [227] 1946, 1947, 2008
Slave Trade, Comm. *cl.* 1, [230] 850

Hall, Mr. A. W., *Oxford*
Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1923
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1247, 1266; *add. cl.* 2010, 2020; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 548
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R., Motion for Adjournment, [227] 370

Halsey, Mr. T. F., *Herts*
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1236

Hamilton, Marquess of, *Donegal Co.*
Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 443
India—Famine in Behar, [230] 1047
Merchant Shipping Act—"Strathclyde," The, [227] 1024

Hamilton, Lord C. J., *Lynn Regis*
Army—Military Adjutants, [227] 1767
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, [227] 1775
Metropolitan Railway, 2R. Amendt. [227] 808
Parliament—Private Bills—Canvassing in the House, Res. [227] 1493
Railway Passenger Duty, [227] 1020

Hamilton, Lord G. F. (Under Secretary of State for India), *Middlesex*
Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 142, 143
Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [227] 1280, 1282

[*cont.*

Hamilton, Lord G. F.—*cont.*
East India—Christianity, Address for Papers, [227] 234
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [231] 982, 1053
India—Miscellaneous Questions
  Ameer of Kashgar, The, [228] 270
  Army—Artillery Officers, [227] 1567;—Royal Warrant, 1872, [228] 1625;—Banda and Kirwee Booty, [231] 269, 821; [230] 1394;—Bombay — Native Army, [227] 683;—Furlough and Retiring Regulations, [231] 6;—Furlough Rules, [229] 919;—Native Army, [229] 370;—Orphans of Soldiers, Allowances to, [229] 369;—Roman Catholic Chaplains, [230] 1280, 1281, 1396
  Bengal, Office of Advocate General, [228] 68
  Bishopric in Northern India, [229] 265
  Bombay—Revenue Jurisdiction Act, 1876, [229] 926
  Civil Service of India—Competition, [231] 719;—Indian Civil Service, [228] 474;—Indian Covenanted Civil Servants, [230] 620; — Regulations, [227] 1203;—Uncovenanted Civil Servants, [227] 1869
  Coolie Immigration from India to Guiana, [227] 1717
  East India—Army—Superannuation, &c. [227] 1707
  Ecclesiastical Establishments, [227] 674
  Factory Legislation, [227] 301
  Indian Finance — Exchanges, [227] 262; [231] 119;—Indian Budget, [228] 1404; [229] 1895;—New Loan, [229] 43;—Silver, Depreciation of, [227] 260;—Tenders for Bills on, [227] 265
  Indian Gaols, [229] 1516
  Indian Tariff Act, [228] 1484; [229] 50;—Correspondence, [228] 1627; — Tariff Act, 1875, [227] 1714;—Tariff Act, 1870—Despatches, [230] 7
  Kirwee, Ex-Chiefs of, [228] 477
  Legislative Council, Acts of the, [230] 426
  Leprosy, [231] 700
  Madras Irrigation Company, [230] 420
  Madras Irrigation Works, [228] 699
  Nizam State Railway—Loans to Indian Princes, [229] 1346
  Oude, Ex-King of—Debts, [230] 620
  Presidency Magistrates Bill, [228] 475
  Roman Catholic Cathedrals, [230] 1889, 1890
India—Bengal Famine, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1845, 1862
India, Council of (Pensions), Res. [227] 237
India Office Return, [231] 698
Indian Legislation, Leave, [227] 198; 2R. 467; Bill withdrawn, [229] 258
Metropolis—Indian and Colonial Museum, [230] 617, 1398; [231] 974
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 151, 152; *cl.* 1, 330, 333
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 632

Hamilton, Mr. I. T., *Dublin Co.*
Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. [227] 469

Hammond, Lord
Turkey—Berlin Memorandum, [230] 400
Turkey—Treaties of 1856, Res. [231] 107
United States—Extradition, Address for Correspondence, [230] 1800

Hamond, Mr. C. F., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1401, 1409; *cl.* 11, 1420; *cl.* 26, 1503
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1778; Consid. Amendt. [230] 477
Turkey—Turkish Finance, [229] 1354
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1738, 1742

Hampton, Lord
Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 809; Comm. *add. cl.* 946
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [230] 327
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, Traffic at, [227] 550
Sugar Convention, 1875—Refusal of the Dutch Chamber, [228] 557

Hanbury, Mr. R. W., *Tamworth*
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. Amendt. [227] 700, 849, 861
Ionian Islands—Treaty of 1864—Public Debt, [230] 7
Spain—British Subjects, Detention of, [229] 1272
Turkey — Salonica — Murder of the Consuls, [229] 925
Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Insurrection in, Res. [231] 139

Hankey, Mr. T., *Peterborough*
Bankers Deposits—Financial Panics, Res. [229] 791
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 977; *cl.* 9, 1212
Income Tax—Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1875, [229] 668
Municipal Officers Superannuation (No. 2), 2R. [227] 326
National Gallery—Wynn Ellis Bequest, [227] 560
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1774, 1775
Post Office—Postal Rates, Reduction of, [227] 303
Public Works Loans, Comm. [230] 975
Royal Mint—New Site, [231] 420
Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [227] 993

Harbours of Refuge
Dover, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, [231] 973
Dungeness, Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 21, [227] 553

Harbours of Refuge — The North East Coast

- Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, [230] 1972
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 28, To leave out from "That," and add "the great loss of life and property annually occurring to our shipping on the north east coast of England shows that there is a deficiency of adequate Harbour accommodation in that district; and this House urges on Her Majesty's Government the construction on that coast of a suitable Harbour of Refuge and for strategic purposes" (*Sir Eardley Wilmot*), *v.*, [231] 27; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

HARCOURT, Sir W. G. V., *Oxford City*

- Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [229] 1702, 1705; Comm. [230] 1150; Consid. [231] 867; *add. cl.* 871; *cl.* 13, 881; Amendt. 884
- Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1752
- Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1366, 1376
- Commons, Comm. [229] 1252; *add. cl.* 1570, 1571, 1575
- Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [227] 1282
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1712, 1716, 2018; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 482; Amendt. 494, 524, 527
- Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 860, 861
- Fugitive Slave Commission—The Report, [229] 1976
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 889
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) (No. 2), 2R. [228] 1890
- Judicature Acts—Judges on Circuit, [230] 1967
- 228] Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 14, 1586, 1589; *cl.* 15, 1596, 1598, 1601, 1616, 1620, 1621; *cl.* 16, 1783; *cl.* 19, 1882; *add. cl.* 1921, 1933, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1944
- 229] 57, 61, 220, 223; Consid. *add. cl.* 1060; *cl.* 18, 1072; Amendt. *ib.*, 1074, 1075; *cl.* 20, 1078
- Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1031, 1032
- Navy—Coroners in Naval Districts, [231] 115
- Offences against the Person, Comm. [228] 1622
- Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1968; [231] 977
- Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 493
- Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 327
- Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1879; Consid. [231] 284
- Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [228] 1812; *cl.* 11, 1814
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 598
- Royal Style and Title, [227] 2013, 2014
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 95, 97; *cl.* 1, 300, 302, 307, 331; Amendt. 335, 336, 1097
- Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 438, 448, 461
- Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1468
- Turkey—Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [231] 1111, 1125

[*cont.*

HARCOURT, Sir W. G. V.—*cont.*

- United States—Extradition Treaty, [231] 977;—Caldwell, Case of, [230] 946;—Return of Cases, [231] 424;—Winslow Case, [229] 777, 1113
- University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1121
- University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1750
- Unreformed Municipal Corporations (England and Wales), Res. [227] 1156

HARDCASTLE, Mr. E., *Lancashire, S.E.*

- Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [227] 1282
- County Palatine of Lancaster (Clerk of the Peace), 2R. [227] 335; Comm. Amendt. 1161; Consid. *cl.* 1, 1778
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [230] 1288; *add. cl.* 2008; [231] 24, 65; Schedule 1, Amendt. 68; Amendt. 69
- Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1178
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 901
- Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1005
- Prisons, 2R. [230] 910
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 601

HARDY, Right Hon. Gathorne (Secretary of State for War), *Oxford University*

- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Aldershot, Barracks at, [227] 405;—Insubordination at—St. Patrick's Day, [228] 471
  - Army and Auxiliary Forces — Returns, [228] 1760
  - Army and Navy—Surgeons, [229] 777
  - Army List—Her Majesty the Queen, [230] 1626
  - Arrears of Pay, Return of, [231] 698
  - Captain Roberts, 94th Regiment, [229] 1970, 1971; [230] 9; [231] 418
  - Chaplains—Compensation, [229] 1664
  - Commissariat and Transport Officers, [228] 66
  - Commissions, Sale of—Royal Warrant of 1870, [227] 1023
  - Connaught Rangers, [227] 261
  - Desertion—Samuel Chappell, Case of, [229] 1348
  - Drill and Exercise in Hot Weather, [230] 1526
  - Forage Allowances, [228] 1835; [230] 1621
  - Forage to Mounted Officers, [229] 1353
  - Grenadier Guards—Colour-Sergeant Brown, Case of, [230] 422
  - Guards, Brigade of, Special Allowances to the, [228] 968; [229] 1993;—Stock Purse Fund Allowances, [228] 1762
  - Home District Command, [227] 1870
  - Hythe, Military Scandal at, [227] 259
  - Increased Pay of the Soldiers, [227] 1296
  - India—Arrears of Pay, [231] 417
  - India—Service of European Regiments, [231] 120
  - Indian and Home Services, [227] 397
  - Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 555, 1230, 1295;—The Model, [229] 50
  - Lieutenant Colonels of Depôt Battalions, [228] 1836

[*cont.*

HARDY, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*

- Line and Scientific Corps—Garrison at Belfast, [230] 1971
- Majors of Cavalry, Supernumerary, [228] 75
- Medical Department—Examinations, [227] 257; [231] 1077
- Medical Officers, [227] 1799; [228] 476; [230] 426
- Medical Report, [231] 254
- Medical School, [228] 882
- Medical Service — Civilian Doctors, [227] 401
- Metropolis—Sentries, [227] 1715
- Military Etiquette, [231] 1153
- Military Prisoners—Gunner Charlton, Case of, [227] 257; [231] 875;—Handcuffs, [231] 422
- Model Cavalry Barracks, [227] 1717
- Omagh, Barracks at, [227] 260
- Ordnance Corps, Promotion in the, [227] 482
- Pay of Soldiers and Marines, [227] 1773
- Pension Warrant, The, [230] 256
- Pensions, Payment of, [230] 1810
- Promotion and Retirement, Commission on, [227] 260; [231] 972
- Purchase and Exchange, [231] 699
- Recruiting, [227] 1795; [229] 1632
- Regimental Exchanges, [230] 1178
- Reserve, The, [227] 1206
- Retired Officers, [230] 245
- Royal Artillery (India), [228] 1323
- Royal Artillery—Lieutenant Colonels, [228] 1098;—Non-Commissioned Officers, [229] 1603
- Sea Ports Defences—Firth of Forth, [227] 1566
- Senior Surgeons-Major, [230] 1048
- Soldiers, Accommodation for, [227] 1021
- Veterinary Department, [230] 1474
- Veterinary Surgeons, [227] 1864; [228] 620, 1830
- Walker, Lieutenant, Case of, [231] 971
- War Department Contracts, [228] 619
- Winchester Barracks, [230] 249

- Army—Auxiliary Forces—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Bucks Yeomanry, [231] 420
  - 1st Surrey Militia Regiment, [230] 1965
  - Londonderry Militia, [228] 1484
  - Militia, Adjutants of, [227] 674; [228] 1760; [229] 262; [230] 1621
  - Militia Ballot Act, [229] 1418
  - Militia Quartermasters — Retiring Allowances, [227] 814
  - Militia Regiments, Supplies to, [229] 926
  - Militia Staff Pensions, [230] 1172
  - Militia, Staff Sergeants of, [227] 813;—Pensions, [229] 1424; [230] 1172
  - Militia Storehouses in Middlesex, [229] 1894
  - Militia Surgeons—Compensation, [231] 697, 970;—Regulations, [227] 557; [229] 919
  - Queen's County Militia Regiment, [229] 1424
  - Somersetshire Militia, 1st, [229] 1665
  - Volunteer Adjutants, [227] 1710
  - Yeomanry Adjutants, [228] 1908
  - Yeomanry Trumpeters and Bands, [230] 247, 851

HARDY, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*

- Army Mobilization—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Irish Militia, [230] 1698
  - Localization of the Forces, [229] 1667
  - Longford Rifle Militia, [231] 691
  - Mobilization of Army Corps, [227] 556; [228] 69;—Volunteers, 968
  - Mobilization of the Forces, [230] 261, 382, 383;—Estimates, [229] 1418, 1420;—The Reserve, [230] 619
  - Monaghan Militia, [230] 1969
  - Roman Catholic Militiamen, [230] 1629
  - Wexford Militia, [230] 1818
- Army — Civil Departments (Employment of Soldiers), Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1991
- Army — Knightsbridge Barracks, Res. [227] 1762
- Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 976
- Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1751, 1753, 1764; Comm. 1782; Consid. Amendt. 2023
- Army Estimates—Full pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, and Half-Pay, [229] 1659
  - Land Forces, [227] 1236, 1277, 1475, 1476, 1479;—Pay and Allowances, &c., 1486, 1487
  - Military Education, Establishments for, [229] 1656, 1657
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, [227] 1775
  - Miscellaneous Services, [229] 1657
  - Out-Pensions, [229] 1659
  - Reserve Force, [227] 1777
  - Volunteer Corps, Pay and Allowances, [227] 1777
  - Warlike and other Stores, [229] 1646
  - War Office, [229] 1658
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1652, 1653, 1654
- Army Estimates, Res. [227] 1451, 1453
- Army Purchase Estimate—Army Purchase Commission, [229] 2022
- Barristers and Advocates Fees, 2R. [229] 335
- Brussels International Exhibition—Sick and Wounded Soldiers, [230] 1477
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 737
- Dover—East Cliff, [231] 1155
- Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 32; Comm. *cl.* 26, 1504; *add. cl.* 1867, 1892
- Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 694, 752, 850, 851, 881
- Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 306
- Knightsbridge Barracks — "Preservation of Peace" in London, [228] 64
- Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, Res. [228] 1250
- Mutiny, [227] 1873; Comm. *cl.* 106, [228] 913; *cl.* 107, 914; Consid. 1036
- Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [230] 471
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the Session, [231] 126
  - Leitrim County Election—Captain O'Beirne, [230] 179, 261
  - Public Petitions—Monastic and Conventual Institutions, [228] 1403
- Parliament — Business of the House, Res. Amendt. [227] 473
- Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 498
- Parliament—Public Petition from a Foreign Town — Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1419, 1420
- Plumstead and Wormholt Commons, Res. [231] 828, 830, 831

HARDY, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
Public Health—Sheerness Sewers, [231] 416
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 303
Royal Titles Act—Commissions in the Militia, [229] 106
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 389, 395, 407
University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1124, 1125
University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1712, 1747, 1750

HARDY, Mr. J. S., *Rye*
Fisheries (England)—Rye Bay, [230] 253

HARRISON, Mr. J. F., *Kilmarnock, &c.*
Criminal Law—Executions, Expense of, [229] 206
India—Presidency Magistrates Bill, [228] 474

HARROWBY, Earl of
County Palatine of Lancaster (Clerk of the Peace), 2R. [228] 560
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [230] 124
Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Comm. [230] 1522
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 1085
University of Oxford, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 946

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of *New Radnor*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1278
Reserve Force, [227] 1777
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1392
Commons, Comm. [229] 1251, 1536
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 998
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Res. [229] 1287
Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
Mr. Cave, Instructions to, [227] 138
Mr. Cave's Mission, [228] 563, 566, 623
Suez Canal—Dues, Convention as to, [227] 684, 685, 812
Suez Canal Administration—Surtax, [228] 1326
Suez Canal Shares, Purchase of, [227] 226 227
Elementary Education, 2R. [229] 1960; Comm. [230] 1251; *add. cl.* 1726; Consid. Amendt. [231] 438; *cl.* 14, 493, 495
Exchequer Bonds, 3R. [227] 1435
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 877
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 702
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1097
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 70
Business of the Session, [231] 122, 124
Derby Day, [229] 1275
Public Business, Arrangement of, [227] 1125; [228] 1181, 1183, 1184, 1328; [229] 491, 492, 1054, 1195; [230] 429, 1631, 1639
Whitsuntide Recess, [229] 1522

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [227] 472; [231] 708
Parliament—Private Bills—Canvassing in the House, Res. [227] 1495
Parliament — Privilege — Political Committee of the Reform Club, Res. [229] 1675
Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1676
Prisons, 2R. [230] 314, 934, 935
Royal Titles, 2R. [227] 1757; Comm. Amendt. [228] 75, 158, 273; *cl.* 1, 299, 300, 302, 317
Royal Titles—The Proclamation, [228] 1629, 1768, 1773
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 462
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 848
Supply, Report, [227] 998
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, [227] 288; Res. 644
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
Berlin Note, [229] 1605, 1609
Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [231] 742
Eastern Question—Ministerial Statement, [227] 1521; [230] 267, 883
Revolted Provinces—Reported Outbreak of Hostilities, [230] 873
Salonica Murders— Correspondence, [230] 1821
Servia, [230] 623
Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Insurrection in, Res. [231] 216, 225
University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1750

HATHERLEY, Lord
Appeals—Standing Orders, Res. [227] 1201
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [227] 919
Bankruptcy, 1R. [229] 1508; 2R. [230] 234
Fugitive Slaves—The Circulars, Petition, [227] 1564
Royal Titles, 3R. [228] 1392, 1979
University of Oxford, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 943

HAVELOCK, Sir H. M., *Sunderland*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Commissariat and Transport Officers, [228] 66
Mobilization Scheme, The New, [230] 381;—The Reserve, 618, 619
Pay of Soldiers and Marines, [227] 1771
Promotion and Retirement, Commission on, [227] 260; [231] 972
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 954
Central Asia—Khanate of Khokand, Address for Papers, [229] 130, 143
Church Bodies (Gibraltar)—The Ordinances, Motion for an Address, [228] 769
Civil Departments (Employment of Soldiers), Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1987, 1997; Nomination of Committee, [229] 754
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1286; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1410, 1412; *cl.* 7, 1415; *add. cl.* 2002, 2015
India—Native Army, [229] 370
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 874
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 106, [228] 913
Navy—Royal Marines, [228] 1527
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 389, 396

[*cont.*

HAY, Admiral Right Hon. Sir J. C. D., *Stamford*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 40
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 732
Iron-clad Navies, British and Foreign, [227] 1911, 1912
Mercantile Marine—Rule of the Road at Sea, [227] 403
Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1831
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 908; *cl.* 5, 1153; *cl.* 16, 1798; *add. cl.* [229] 64, 73, 232
Navy—Royal Marines, [228] 1523
Navy—Captain Sulivan, Res. [230] 1322
Navy—Henwood, Mr. Charles Frederick, Case of, Motion for a Select Committee, [229] 1617
Navy — H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of the, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1066, 1070
Navy Estimates—Coastguard Service—Naval Reserve, &c. [228] 1553
  Men and Boys, &c. [227] 1937
  Miscellaneous Services, [230] 475
  Seamen and Marines, [228] 1547
Parliament—Public Business, [229] 2019

HAYTER, Mr. A. D., *Bath*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1227
  Metropolis—Sentries, [227] 1715
  Military Prisoners—Handcuffs, [231] 422
  Mobilization of Corps—Volunteers, [228] 968
Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1752
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, Motion for reporting Progress, [227] 1488, 1775
  Pay and Allowances, &c., Land Forces, [227] 1487
  Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1654
Diocese of Exeter, Leave, [229] 1602
Dover Pier—English and Foreign Mail Boats, [230] 1885
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1409; *add. cl.* 1711; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 535
Endowed Schools—St. John's Hospital, Exeter, [229] 38
Great Western Railway Accident, [231] 8
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1598
Metropolitan Board of Works—Finance, [231] 1204
Midland Railway—The Radstock Accident—Block System, [231] 1078
Purchase and Exchange, [231] 699
Turkey—Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [231] 731, 877
  Servian Invasion, [230] 950
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1361

Heligoland
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of (1) the capitulation of September 1807 by which Heligoland was ceded to Great Britain; (2) the Order in Council of 7th January 1864 relating to the Government of Heligoland; and (3) Papers explaining the revocation of that Order in 1868 (*The Earl of Rosebery*) *Mar* 13, [227] 1851; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to
Resolved that an humble address be presented to Her Majesty for Copies of the Order in Council of 7th January, 1864, relating to the Government of Heligoland, and Papers explaining the revocation of that Order in 1868 (*Parl. P. l.* 49.)
Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 16, [229] 1972

HENLEY, Right Hon. J. W., *Oxfordshire*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. *cl.* 13, [231] 884
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [230] 1602
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1293; *add. cl.* [231] 64
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 361
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 897
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1008
Merchant Shipping, Comm. [228] 529; *cl.* 3, 678, 902; *add. cl.* [229] 216; Lords Amendts. Consid. [231] 1179
Prisons, 2R. [230] 892
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 595
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1364

HENNIKER, Lord
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [229] 1030; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [230] 122; *cl.* 11, 127
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 9, [231] 939
Felstead School—The Rev. W. Grignon, Dismissal of, [228] 1748
Industrial and Provident Societies, 2R. [230] 127
Poor Law Amendment, 2R. [230] 1275
Vivisection—Legislation, [227] 2008
Wild Fowl Preservation, 2R. [230] 846; 3R. 1470

HENRY, Mr. Mitchell, *Galway Co.*
Adulterated Drinks at Fairs, Sale of, &c. (Ireland), [228] 65
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, Res. [227] 1762
Constabulary (Ireland), [230] 1808
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. Amendt. [229] 1357, 1374, 1379
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 775
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 2002; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 529, 552
Home Office—Deputations, [230] 1623
Irish Church Temporalities Commission—National Monuments (Ireland), [231] 693
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 299, 315
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, Motion for reporting Progress, [230] 145, 146, 270, 271; 3R. 339, 341
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 109
  Derby Day, [229] 1276
  Leitrim County Election—Captain O'Beirne, [230] 182

HENRY, Mr. Mitchell—*cont.*
- Order—Balloting for Motions, [230] 14
  - Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1637
  - Strangers, Exclusion of, Motion for Adjournment, [230] 1552, 1555, 1556
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [231] 711
- Post Office—Telegraph Cards, [227] 137
  - Telegraph Messages, [227] 1413
- Prisons, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 935, 936
- Supply—Lord Privy Seal, [227] 503
  - Public Education, Ireland, [231] 278, 279
  - Public Works in Ireland, [227] 1843, 1845
- Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 640
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 351, 364
- Turkey—Salonica Murders—Correspondence, [230] 1820

HERBERT, Mr. H. A., *Kerry Co.*
- Criminal Law (Ireland)—Kerry Assizes, [228] 470
- Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 787
- Ireland, Crime in—Returns, [228] 266
- Knightsbridge Barracks — "Preservation of Peace" in London, [228] 64
- Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 791
- National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, Res. [228] 235
- Parliament — Privilege — Monastic and Conventual Institutions, [228] 1319, 1397
- Parliament—Private Bills—Canvassing in the House, Res. [227] 1493
- Tralee Savings Bank, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1584

HERMON, Mr. E., *Preston*
- Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 959; Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1290, 1295; *cl.* 16, 1497; *cl.* 26, 1504; *add. cl.* 1850
- Jurors Qualification (Ireland), 3R. [230] 340
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 64, 210
- Municipal Officers Superannuation (No. 2), Comm. [227] 1603
- Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1877
- Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 541
- Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1596
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 114
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1343, 1344
- South Eastern Railway, 2R. [228] 61
- Trade Marks Registration Act, 1875, [229] 40

HERSCHELL, Mr. F., *Durham*
- Barristers and Advocates Fees, 2R. [229] 343
- Commons, Consid. [230] 135
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1708
- Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [227] 765, 820
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 1586; *cl.* 15, 1618; *cl.* 27, 1916; *add. cl.* 1936; [229] 58; Consid. *cl.* 11, 1070; *cl.* 20, 1079

[*cont.*

HERSCHELL, Mr. F.—*cont.*
- Parliament—Privilege—Political Committee of the Reform Club, Res. [229] 1678
- Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 413
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 599
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1321, 1326

HERVEY, Lord F., *Bury St. Edmunds*
- Coroners, Res. [230] 1301
- Education Code — Subjects, Choice of, Res. [227] 1805
- Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1286; *cl.* 4, 1295; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1399; *cl.* 7, 1414; *cl.* 26, Amendt. 1502, 1505; *add. cl.* 1658; Amendt. 1661, 1662, 1708
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1283
- Metropolis—National Gallery—Turner Pictures, [230] 618
  - St. James's Park, [229] 1664
- Parliament, Acts of—Report of Select Committee, Res. [228] 575
- Parliament — Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London), Explanation, [230] 1178; Motion for Adjournment, 1179
- Primary Education, [228] 1410
- Turkey—Eastern Question, [230] 875
- University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1121, 1126
- University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1732

HEYGATE, Mr. W. U., *Leicestershire, S.*
- Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), 2R. [229] 913
- Elementary Education, 2R. [229] 1924; Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [230] 1417; *cl.* 14, 1452; *cl.* 34, 1514; *add. cl.* 1644; [231] 23, 24
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1287, 1289
- Elementary Education Acts — Miscellaneous Questions
  - Attendance at Schools, [229] 1036
  - Certificated Children — Clause 14, [230] 1630
  - Public Elementary Schools, [227] 1204
  - School Boards, [229] 1895
- Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 347
- Metropolis—Snow, Removal of, [227] 399
- Municipal Officers Superannuation (No. 2), Comm. [227] 1605
- Parliament—Business of the House—Opposed Business, Res. [227] 186

HICK, Mr. J., *Bolton*
- Pollution of Rivers, 3R. [231] 561

Highways Bill

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) *April* 10, [228] 1554; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 129]

Highway Boards, Question, Mr. Goldney; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 31, [228] 967

Bill withdrawn * *July* 24

HILL, Mr. A. Staveley, *Staffordshire, W.*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. [231] 863
Commons, Comm. [229] 1380
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1087
Offences against the Person, Comm. [227] 1190
Parliament—Private Bills — Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 494
United States—Extradition Treaty, [230] 499

HILL, Mr. T. R., *Worcester*
Criminal Law—Dietary at Millbank Prison, [231] 970
Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1662
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [231] 65; Consid. *cl.* 14, 478

HODGSON, Mr. K. D., *Bristol*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 6, [229] 1199

HOGG, Lt.-Colonel Sir J. M., *Truro*
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1228
London Municipal Government, Res. [229] 1801
Metropolis Improvements — Miscellaneous Questions
Northumberland Avenue, [229] 205
Paving, Cleansing, and Lighting, [230] 424
Streets, Repairing of, [227] 815
Thames Embankment, [230] 1042;—High Tides, 1393
Victoria Embankment, [227] 1867
Metropolis — Hyde Park Corner, Res. [229] 1580
Metropolis—Parochial System, Res. [227] 310
Metropolis Gas Companies, 2R. [229] 305; Motion for a Committee, 306
Metropolitan Board of Works, 2R. [227] 807; [230] 853
Metropolitan Fire Brigade, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 361
Metropolitan Gas Companies, 2R. [228] 597
South Eastern Railway, 2R. [228] 61
Thames, Prevention of Floods in the, [227] 1568

HOLKER, Sir J. (*see* ATTORNEY GENERAL, The)

HOLLAND, Sir H. T., *Midhurst*
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 301
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 905; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 1915, 1917
Metropolis—University Boat Race—Hammersmith Bridge, [228] 883
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 624

HOLMS, Mr. J., *Hackney*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Army and Auxiliary Forces—Returns, [228] 1760
Forage Allowance, [230] 1621
Grenadier Guards—Colour-Sergeant Brown, Death of, [230] 421
Mobilization of the Forces, [230] 260, 369, 371, 383
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 929, 989

[*cont.*

HOLMS, Mr. J. —*cont.*
Army and Navy Expenditure Accounts, Audit of, [229] 2001
Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1751
Army Estimates—Land Forces, Motion for reporting Progress, [227] 1277
Army Estimates, Res. [227] 1451
Civil Departments (Employment of Soldiers), Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1995
Civil Service—Clerks, Higher Division of, [227] 554
Metropolis—Victoria Park, [229] 927
Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Insurrection in, Res. [231] 168
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1756

HOLMS, Mr. W., *Paisley*
Army—Artillery Officers (India), [227] 1567
Births and Deaths, Registration of—Certificates of Deaths, [228] 1325
Burgesses (Scotland), Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [227] 1779
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1535, 1645, 2004
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 728;—New Circular, [230] 1962
Merchant Shipping, Comm. Amendt. [228] 539; *cl.* 24, 1913
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 409
Poor Law (Scotland), Comm. [230] 507
Slave Trade—Mozambique, [230] 128

HOLT, Mr. J. M., *Lancashire, N.E.*
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [231] * 902
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 12, [230] 1449; *add. cl.* 2017
Navy—Vestments of Navy Chaplains, [231] 976

Holyhead Harbour—Wreck of the Steamship "Edith"
Question, Mr. Serjeant Sherlock; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 15, [229] 670

HOME, Captain D. Milne, *Berwick*
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 969

Home Office, The—Deputations
Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 20, [230] 1623

Homicide Law Amendment Bill
(*Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. Whitwell*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Sir Eardley Wilmot*) *Feb* 16, [227] 373; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 75]
2R. debate adjourned, after short debate *Mar* 8 1657
Debate resumed *July* 26, [230] 1942; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

HOPE, Mr. A. J. B. Beresford, *Cambridge University*
- Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 6, [231] 766; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 770; Consid. *cl.* 13, Amendt. 880
- Commons, Comm. [229] 1251, 1380, 1385; *cl.* 2, 1392; *cl.* 8, 1527; *cl.* 25, 1564; *add. cl.* 1570; Preamble, 1575, 1576; Consid. [230] 133, 134, 135, 139
- Diocese of Exeter, Leave, [229] 1602
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1411; *cl.* 11, 1419, 1443; *add. cl.* 1545, 1903, 1904; [231] 67; Consid. *cl.* 14, 478
- Fine Arts, Motion for an Address, [229] 291
- Increase of the Episcopate, Leave, [227] 116; 2R. 337, 351, 370; [230] 1020
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House, [229] 1053
  - Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 585, 587
  - Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 130
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [227] 471, 473
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 583
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 117
- Supply—British Museum, [231] 263
  - National Portrait Gallery, [231] 265
  - Natural History Museum, [229] 1590
  - Public Buildings, [229] 1585, 1586
  - Science and Art Department, [231] 263
  - Wellington Monument, [229] 1590
- Sweden—Stockholm, British Church at, [228] 1474, 1475; [231] 121, 714
- University of Cambridge, Leave, [229] 835; 2R. [230] 1078

HOPWOOD, Mr. C. H., *Stockport*
- Army—Desertion—Samuel Chappell, Case of, [229] 1347
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1391
- Criminal Law—Police at Plymouth, [231] 975
  - Summary Cases, Administration in, [229] 1993, 1998
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1725; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 491, 525, 529, 543, 549
- Law and Justice—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Justice, Summary Administration of, [227] 811
  - Queen's Proctor, [231] 1075
  - Yorkshire Magistracy, [230] 1044
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. [228] 529; *add. cl.* 1941; [229] 225
- Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. [230] 162
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 600
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1320

HOUGHTON, Lord
- Burials in Churchyards, 2R. [229] 1092
- Foreign Decorations, [229] 1263, 1267, 1269
- Railway Accidents, Royal Commission on—Brakes, [229] 1097
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 1090
- University of Oxford, 2R. [227] 1690; Comm. *cl.* 12, [228] 939

House Occupiers Disqualification Removal Bill (*Sir Henry Wolff, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Ryder*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 29]

228] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 22, 465; Debate adjourned

. Debate resumed *Mar* 23, 551
- Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Evans*); after short debate, Question put; A. 76, N. 134; M. 58
- Original Question again proposed; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Question put; A. 79, N. 122; M. 43
- Original Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Macdonald*); Question put; A. 76, N. 118; M. 42
- Original Question again proposed; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Locke*); Question put; A. 71, N. 106; M. 35
- Original Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Briggs*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate further adjourned

. Order for resuming Adjourned Debate read *April* 24, 1623
- Moved, "That the Order be discharged" (*Mr. Waddy*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Debate further adjourned

229] Debate resumed *June* 8, 1598
- Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Hayter*); after short debate, Question put; A. 13, N. 57; M. 44
- Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
- Committee [Dropped]

HOWARD, Mr. E. S., *Cumberland, E.*
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1675
- Salmon Fisheries Act, 1861 — The Solway, [230] 1175

HUBBARD, Right Hon. J. G., *London*
- Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 13, [231] 772
- Army—Auxiliary Forces—Bucks Yeomanry, [231] 419
- Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1924
- Cheques on Bankers, Leave, [227] 315
- Crossed Cheques, [227] 684; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [230] 1515; 3R. Amendt. [231] 1207, 1218; Re-comm. *cl.* 12, 1220
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 726; Comm. Amendt. 965; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1203; *cl.* 9, 1213
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 7, [230] 1415; *cl.* 14, 1453; *cl.* 34, 1512; *add. cl.* 1669, 1670, 1891, 1991, 2017
- Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 358
- Maritime Contracts, [229] 42
- Parliament—Easter Recess, [228] 1100
  - Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 621, 1639
- Public Works Loans, Comm. [230] 971
- Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1759
- Valuation—Surveyors of Taxes, [228] 1760
- Valuation of Property, Leave, [227] 252
- Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act Amendment, Leave, [227] 371; 2R. 1162

[*cont.*

Hubbard, Right Hon. J. G.—*cont.*
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1129
Inland Revenue—Armorial Bearings, [230] 1391
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1331
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1727

Hubbard, Mr. E., *Buckingham*
Crossed Cheques, 3R. [231] 1215

Hunt, Right Hon. G. W. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *Northamptonshire, N.*
Agricultural Holdings (England) Act—Greenwich Hospital Estates, [228] 65
Arctic Expedition, [227] 401
Admiralty Instructions, [230] 422
"Pandora," Officers of the, [229] 1110
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [230] 1612, 1614
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 701, 704, 705
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Res. [229] 1289
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1216
Fiji Islands—Epidemic, The, [227] 1023; [231] 255, 256
Fisheries (England)—Rye Bay, [230] 253
Fugitive Slaves—The Circulars, [230] 6, 1962
Mercantile Marine—Blackwood's "Night Helm Indicator," [227] 1208
Shipwrecked Vessels, [229] 1190
Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1827
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
"Alberta" and "Mistletoe," Collision of, [227] 1204;—Report of Court of Inquiry, [228] 1410, 1476, 1477, 1478;—Captain Welsh, [229] 1194
Anchors, [228] 1479
Anchors and Cables—(The "Victoria and Albert"), [228] 562
Arrest of Seamen—Leave-breaking, [228] 1907
Boilers, Deterioration of, [231] 968
Cadets, [227] 816
Circular Ships, [227] 1798
Coal, [227] 1413
Commanders — Order in Council, 1864, [229] 104
Condemned Ships, [228] 268
Coroners in Naval Districts, [231] 115
Creed Register, [229] 928
Designs of Ships of War, [231] 1157
Detached Squadron, [228] 171
Devonport, New Dock at, [229] 41
Discipline Act—Flogging in the Navy, [229] 487
Dockyards, &c.—Foreign Officers, Admission of, [229] 1349
Dockyards, Superintendents of, [231] 967
Engineer Service, [229] 44, 1040
H.M.S. "Caledonia"—The "Lion" Training Ship, [229] 1603
H.M.S. "Devastation," [227] 1207
H.M.S. "Raleigh," [230] 257
H.M.S. "Serapis," Accident to, [227] 1708
H.M.S. "Thunderer"—Explosion, [230] 1525, 1526, 1887, 1888, 1972

[*cont.*

Hunt, Right Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
H.M.S. "Vanguard," [228] 271; [229] 1194; [231] 1076, 1157;—The Return, [230] 337, 870, 1478
Iron-clad Navies, British and Foreign, [227] 1902
Meat, [230] 244
Mediterranean Squadron, [230] 1819
Naval Cadet College, Milford Haven, [228] 879
Naval College—Greenwich—Examinations, [227] 1865
Naval Interpreters, [228] 969, 1327
Naval Officers and the Press, [229] 36
Naval Officers holding Civil Appointments, [228] 1829
Navigating Officers, [227] 682
Provisions, Condemned—The Return, [229] 1519
Reserve Forces — Captains in the Royal Marine Artillery, [228] 67
Retired Naval Commanders, [231] 818
Royal Marine Light Infantry, [230] 1392; [231] 1070
Royal Marines, [228] 1527; — Officers of, [227] 683;—Increase of Pay, 1717
Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, [229] 774
Royal Naval Engineers, [228] 68;—Committee on, [229] 1193
Royal Naval Reserve, [230] 1964; [231] 818
Royal Yacht, [228] 964
Screw Propellers, [227] 1865
Ships' Boats, Lowering, [228] 268
Sub-Lieutenants, [229] 1186
Tenders for Shipbuilding, [230] 1177
Torpedoes—Captain Harvey, [228] 563
Troop Ship "Orontes," [227] 928
Vestments of Navy Chaplains, [231] 976
Widows of Seamen and Marines, [227] 482
Navy, Administration of the, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 437, 439, 447, 449, 452
Navy—"Alberta" and "Mistletoe," Collision, Res. [228] 1504
Navy—Captain Sulivan, Res. [230] 1320, 1326, 1331, 1397
Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. [230] 171
Navy—Henwood, Mr. C., Petition of, Res. [227] 1404; [228] 343; Motion for a Select Committee, [229] 1614, 1764
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of the, [227] 132, 264; Motion for a Paper, 1045, 1047, 1053, 1070, 1870
Navy—Ships of War, Res. [229] 250
Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5, Comm. [231] 658
Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [228] 1550, 1551
Coast Guard Service—Naval Reserve, &c. [228] 1552, 1553; [229] 256, 257
Dockyards, &c. [230] 469, 470
Half Pay, &c. [230] 476
Men and Boys, &c. [227] 1918, 1932, 1934, 1942, 1943
Miscellaneous Services, [230] 473, 474
Repairs, [229] 1820
Scientific Departments, [229] 2019, 2020; [230] 461, 462
Seamen and Marines, [228] 1542, 1548
Steam Machinery, &c. [230] 472, 473
Victuals and Clothing, [228] 1549

[*cont.*

Hunt, Right Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
  Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, [228] 1100
  Science and Art—Transit of Venus, [230] 1169
  Scotch Fisheries, [227] 1418
  Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [230] 1815
  Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [227] 992, 994
    Navy—Excess of Expenditure, [228] 341, 342
  Turkey — Salonica — Murder of the Consuls, [229] 925
  Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1939, 1942

Huntly, Marquess of
  Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), Comm. [229] 184
  Cattle Diseases (England and Ireland)—Privy Council Regulations, [227] 124
  Drugging of Animals, 2R. [229] 261

Hygienie, International Congress of—Brussels
  Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 10, [228] 1483

Imprisonment for Debt Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Fielden, Mr. Thomas Bass, Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Knowles*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 33]
  Bill withdrawn* *June* 16

Inchiquin, Lord
  Grand Juries (Ireland), Res. [229] 1411
  Irish Peerage, 1R. [228] 169 ; 2R. 1162 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1894, 1903 ; *cl.* 3, 1904, 1905 ; Report, Amendt. [229] 189 ; Amendt. 203 ; Preamble, Amendt. 204
  Notices to Quit (Ireland), 2R. [230] 1695

Increase of the Episcopate Bill
(*Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Thomas Brassey*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Beresford Hope*) *Feb* 9, [227] 116 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* [Bill 11]
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 16, 337
  Previous Question proposed, "That that Question be now put" (*Sir Walter Barttelot*) ; after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Hall*) ; after further short debate, Question put ; A. 174, N. 90 ; M. 84 ; Debate adjourned
  Debate resumed *July* 5, [230] 1020 ; after short debate, Question put, and negatived

India
  Miscellaneous Questions
  Acts of the Legislative Council, Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 26, [230] 426

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
  Army (*India*)
  Allowances to Orphans of Soldiers, Question, Mr. O'Reilly ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 11, [229] 369
  Arrears of Pay, Question, Colonel Jervis ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 3, [231] 417
  Artillery Officers—The Royal Warrant, 1872, Question, Mr. W. Holms ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 7, [227] 1567 ; Question, Colonel Jervis ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 6, [228] 1322 ; Question, Colonel Jervis ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *April* 25, 1625
    Memorials—(*Parl. P.* 85)
  Banda and Kirwee Booty, Question, The Lord Mayor ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 13, [230] 1393 ; Question, General Shute ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 7, [231] 692 ; *August* 8, 821 (*Parl. P.* 213)
  Bombay Native Army—Dismissal of a Subadar, Question, Mr. Parnell ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 22, [227] 682
  East India Army—Superannuation, &c. Allowances, Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 9, [227] 1706 *East India* (*Legislation*)—(*P.P.* 102)
  Furlough and Retiring Regulations, Question, Mr. Morris ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 18, [229] 919 ; Question, Colonel Jervis ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 28, [231] 5 ; *August* 7, 698
  Native Army, The, Question, Sir Henry Havelock ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 11, [229] 370
  Service of European Regiments, Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 31, [231] 120

  Bishopric in Northern India, Question, Mr. Cust ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 9, [229] 264 ;—*Ecclesiastical Establishments*, Question, Mr. O'Reilly ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 22, [227] 674 ;—*Roman Catholic Cathedrals*, Questions, Mr. Whalley ; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *July* 25, [230] 1889
  Bombay Revenue Jurisdiction Act, 1876, Question, Mr. Dunbar ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 18, [229] 926

  Civil Service of India
  Indian Civil Service Competition, Observations, Mr. Lowe ; Reply, Lord George Hamilton *August* 7, [231] 717
  Languages, Question, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley, Lord Waveney ; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *July* 17, [230] 1465 ;—*Regulations*, Questions, Mr. Lyon Playfair ; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 2, [227] 1202 ; *Mar* 23, [228] 473 *Parl. P.* [1446]
  The Covenanted Civil Service, Question, Mr. Lowe ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 29, [230] 620
  Uncovenanted Civil Service, Question, Mr. Dalrymple ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 13, [227] 1869

  Coolie Immigration from India to Guiana, Question, Mr. Richard ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 9, [227] 1716
    Parl. P. [1446]

[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

Debts of the Ex-King of Oude, Question, Mr. W. Martin; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 29, [230] 620

Factory System in India—Legislation, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 15, [227] 301

Indian and Colonial Museum—South Kensington, Questions, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *June* 22, [230] 256; *June* 29, 617; *July* 13, 1398; *August* 10, [231] 974 *Parl. P.* 448

Indian Finance

Depreciation of Silver—The Indian Civil and Military Services, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 14, [227] 260
[See title *Silver, Depreciation of*]

Tenders for Bills on Bombay, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 14, [227] 265

The Exchanges, Question, Mr. Beckett-Denison; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 14, [227] 262; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 31, [231] 118

Parl. Papers—

Finance and Revenue Accounts, 1874-5	226
Home Accounts	227
Progress and Condition	406

The Indian Budget, Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *April* 7, [228] 1404; Question, Mr. Leith; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 15, [229] 1895; — *Arrangement of Public Business*, Observations, Question, Mr. Goschen; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *July* 27, [230] 1974

The New Loan, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 4, [229] 43

Indian Gaols, Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 1, [229] 1515

Legislation — Presidency Magistrates Bill, Question, Mr. Fortescue Harrison; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 23, [228] 474

Leprosy, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 7, [231] 700

Madras Irrigation Company, Questions, Mr. Smollett; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 28, [228] 698; *June* 26, [230] 420

Nizam State Railway — Loans to Indian Princes, Question, Mr. Lowe; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 29, [229] 1346

Office of Advocate General of Bengal, Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 16, [228] 68

Petition of Sirdar Narain Singh, Petition presented, Lord Selborne; short debate thereon *May* 16, [229] 769

Slave Trading of Subjects of Native Princes, Observations, The Marquess of Salisbury *June* 22, [230] 236 [See *Slave Trade Bill*]
Despatches . . . . *Parl. P.* [1546]

The Ameer of Kashgar, Question, Sir Trevor Lawrence; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 20, [230] 270

[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

The Ex-Chiefs of Kirwee, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 23, [228] 477

The Famine in Behar, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 6, [230] 1046

India—East India Revenue Accounts

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Lord George Hamilton*) *August* 10, [231] 982

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House views with apprehension the constant additions which are made to the debt of India, and is of opinion that, considering the serious loss that has been caused, and may continue to be caused to India, by the depreciation in the value of silver, no new public works should be undertaken which would necessitate the raising of fresh loans; and that, in order to place the finances of India on a more satisfactory basis, the distinction which is now made between ordinary and extraordinary expenditure should be discontinued" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; matter considered in Committee

Resolved, "That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1875 was £50,570,171; the charges in India, including the collection of the Revenue, Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £40,760,583; the charges in England (including £1,595,878, the value of Stores supplied to India) were £8,245,829; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £1,244,562, making a total charge for the same year of £50,250,974; and there was an excess of Income over Expenditure in that year amounting to £319,197; that the charge for Public Works extraordinary was £2,249,571, and that, including that charge, the excess of Expenditure over Income was £3,930,374"

Resolution reported *August* 11

India—Council of India (Pensions)

Council of India [Pensions] considered in Committee *Feb* 11, [227] 237

Moved, "That it is expedient to authorize the payment, out of the Revenues of India, of any Pension that may be granted to any Member of the Council of India" (*Lord George Hamilton*); after short debate, Motion agreed to

India—(East India) Christianity

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 11, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of—

[*cont.*

India (East India) Christianity—cont.

"1. Circular Letter of Governor General in Council to Local Governments, dated the 14th day of August and the 2nd day of November 1872, calling for Returns of numbers of Christians in congregations, salaries of ministers to same, &c., and of Returns to the same by Local Governments" [and other Papers] (*Mr. O'Reilly*) *v.*, [227] 230; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Papers . . . . *P.P.* 243

India—The Bengal Famine

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 28, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the circumstances of the late famine in India, and into the various systems of relief adopted" (*Mr. Eustace Smith*) *v.*, [228] 1838; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 149, N. 46; M. 103

India—The Council of India—The Indian Tariff Act, 1875

227] Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord
George Hamilton *Mar* 9, 1714; Observations,
Viscount Halifax; Reply, The Marquess of
Salisbury; debate thereon *Mar* 14, 1946;
228] Question, Observations, Viscount Halifax;
Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; short
debate thereon *Mar* 31, 921; Observations,
The Marquess of Salisbury; Reply, The
Duke of Argyll *April* 7, 1378; Question, Mr.
Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton
April 10, 1483;—*The Correspondence*, Question,
General Sir George Balfour; Answer,
Lord George Hamilton *April* 25, 1627;—
229] *Duties on Manufactures*, Question, General
Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor
of the Exchequer *May* 4, 36; Questions,
Mr. Fawcett; Answers, Lord George Hamilton
May 4, 50;—*The Despatches*, Question,
Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton
June 19, [230] 7

Parl. Papers—

Correspondence	56
Dissents recorded	70
Substance of Telegrams	216
Financial Despatch	219
Papers	333
Further Correspondence . . .	[1515]

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Despatch from the Government of India, 72 Public, of 24th December, 1874; Copies of any Dissents to the Despatches of the Secretary of State of 31st May 1876, recorded by Members of the Council of India" (*Earl Granville*) *August* 4, [231] 499; after debate, Motion agreed to

Then, an Address for Copy of reply to despatch from the Government of India, 72 Public, 24th December, 1874, being moved by the Marquess of Salisbury, the same was agreed to

Correspondence. . . . . . *l.* 10, 25

India—The Malay Peninsula

Disturbances in the Malay Peninsula — The Papers, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther. *Feb* 14, [227] 257; Address for further Correspondence (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *Feb* 28, 1000; after short debate, Motion negatived; Explanation, Lord Stanley of Alderley *Mar* 3, 1283; —*The State of Perak*, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 24, [228] 1577

Correspondence, [1505, 1505-I, 1510, 1512]

Murder of Mr. Birch, Observations, Mr. E. Noel; Reply, Mr. J. Lowther; debate thereon *May* 26, [229] 1290

The British Resident in Salangore, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 1, [229] 1516

India—War Office Charges

Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 31, [231] 117

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "it is inexpedient to consider any more Estimates of this kind, until it is satisfactorily proved by proper statements as to how the funds previously advanced during the past five or six years by the India Office, on account of the Military charges defrayed by the War Office for India, have been used by the Treasury, whether in payment of War Office claims or in swelling the Revenue of the Kingdom" (*Sir George Balfour*) *v.*, 653; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Indian Legislation Bill
(*Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Attorney General*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Lord George Hamilton*) *Feb* 10, [227] 198; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 54]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 17, 467
Order for Committee discharged; Bill withdrawn *May* 8, [229] 258

Industrial and Provident Societies Bill
(*Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Cowper-Temple, Mr. Rodwell*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 14 [Bill 68]
Read 2°* *Feb* 23
Committee*; Report *April* 28 [Bill 139]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 10
Considered* *May* 12
Read 3°* *May* 15
Lords Amendts. [Bill 254]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Hartismere*) *May* 16
Read 2ª *June* 20, [230] 127 (No. 90)
Committee* *June* 27 (No. 148)
Report* *July* 3
Read 3ª* *July* 7
Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts. (No. 192)
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 45]

INGRAM, Mr. W. J., *Boston*

Norwich and Boston (Corrupt Voters), Comm. [231] 1055
Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868 — Boston Election, [228] 350

Inns of Court Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Selborne*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 3 (No. 47)
Read 2ª, after short debate *May* 1, [228] 1892
Report *May* 15, [229] 587
Read 3ª* *May* 29

Inns of Court Procedure Amendment Bill
(*Mr. H. B. Sheridan, Mr. Ingram, Mr. Dillwyn*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *July* 19 [Bill 258]
2R. [Dropped]

Intemperance
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the prevalence of habits of intemperance, and into the manner in which those habits have been affected by recent legislation and other causes" (*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*) *June* 30, [230] 715; after debate, Motion agreed to
And, on July 31, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Abp. Canterbury, D. Westminster, E. Shrewsbury, E. Shaftesbury, E. Onslow, E. Morley, E. Kimberley, V. Gordon, V. Hutchinson, V. Canterbury, L. Bp. Peterborough, L. Bp. Exeter, L. Bp. Carlisle, L. Penrhyn, L. Aberdare, L. Cottesloe
A Joint Committee, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 6, [230] 1042

International Law—Submarine Telegraphs
Question, Mr. E. Noel; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 23, [228] 476

Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards) Bill (*Mr. Joseph Cowen, Sir Henry Havelock, Mr. Burt, Mr. Norwood*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 9 [Bill 6]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *May* 17, [229] 848
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir Walter Bartlelot*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 109, N. 274; M. 165
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) Bill (*Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Mr. Birley, Mr. Pease, Mr. Bell*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 10 [Bill 56]
Bill withdrawn* *Mar* 30

Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) (No. 2) Bill
(*Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Mr. Birley, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Pease*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Mar* 30 [Bill 116]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *April* 28, [228] 1886
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Onslow*); after short debate, Question put; A. 73, N. 40; M. 33; Debate adjourned

[*cont.*

Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) (No. 2) Bill—cont.
Debate resumed *May* 15, [229] 753; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2º
Bill withdrawn* *July* 25

Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland) Bill
(*Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Dalrymple, Mr. Maitland, Mr. Edward Jenkins*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1º* *Mar* 1 [Bill 91]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *July* 12, [230] 1371
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Alfred Marten*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

IRELAND
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Adulterated Drinks at Fairs, &c., Sale of, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 16, [228] 65
Cattle Disease—Pleuro-Pneumonia, Questions, Mr. J. W. Barclay, Captain Nolan; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 17, [227] 402; Question, Captain Moore; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 22, [230] 253
Returns—*P.P.* 218
Civil Service, The, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 3, [228] 1099
Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act, 1868—*Petty Sessions Clerks*, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 14, [231] 1200

Education
Intermediate Education, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 14, [227] 263;—*Primary Education—Provincial Model Schools*, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 29, [227] 1122
Model Schools, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 18, [229] 919 (*P.P.* 380)
National Board of Education—Inspectors' Reports, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 29, [230] 615;—*The Staff*, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 4, 950
National Schools, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 4, [229] 46
National School Teachers—Case of Michael Moyna, Question, Mr. W. Johnston; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 26, [230] 421
National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, Observations, Question, The Earl of Donoughmore; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short debate thereon *May* 11, [229] 351; Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 29, 1349;—*Contributory Unions*, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 3, [227] 1294;—*Non-Contributory Unions*, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 17, [227] 404; Questions,

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Captain Nolan; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 28, [228] 1832; *May* 1, 1910; *May* 2, 1986

Return . . . . *P.P.* 100

[See title *Ireland — National School Teachers (Ireland) Act*, 1875]

Queen's Colleges, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 12, [229] 487

"*Results Examination*," Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 23, [228] 473;—*Delay of Payments*, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 3, [230] 868

Workhouse Schools, Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 9, [227] 1711

Report of Commissioners for 1875-6 . . . . *P.P.* 336

National Education, 42nd Report . . . . [1503]

Schools Examined, 1874-5 . 251

Fisheries

Cape Clear Island, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 22, [230] 253

Fisheries Acts—Licences, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 28, [228] 695

Inspectors of Irish Fisheries — Approval of Bye-Laws, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 14, [231] 1201;—*Gunboat*, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 11, [231] 1073;—*The Annual Reports*, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 27, [230] 1966

Trawling Vessels in Galway Bay, Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 7, [228] 1408; *July* 10, [230] 1171

Report of Inspectors for 1875—*P.P.* [1467]

Government Advertisements, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 8, [231] 816

Intemperance—Judges' Charges, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 13, [227] 1865

Irish Ante-Union Statutes, Question, Mr. Law; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Mar* 14, [227] 2015

Irish Churchyards — Legislation, Question, Mr. Fay; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 11, [229] 368

Irish Fines Fund, Question, Mr. Redmond; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 15, [229] 672

Irish Land Act, The—Compensation under the third Clause, Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 10, [227] 135;—*Notices to Quit—Stamps*, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 3, 1294

Irish Parliament, Question, Mr. P. J. Smyth; Answer, Mr. Butt *May* 4, [229] 49

Kilbarry Marsh, Question, Mr. Richard Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 19, [230] 5

Kingstown Harbour, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 23, [229] 1116

Ireland—*cont.*

Labourers' Dwellings—A Commission, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 14, [231] 1197

Law and Justice

Civil Law

Civil Bill Processes, Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 28, [228] 696 Return—*P.P.* 62

Clerks of the Peace, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 3, [228] 1096; Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *July* 3, [230] 851

Return—*P.P.* 237

Coroner, Office of, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 23, [228] 475

Equity Courts—Lord Justice Christian, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 13, [227] 1871; Personal Explanation, Mr. Law; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 14, 2015

Judicature Bill—Court of Common Pleas, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 12, [231] 1153

Landed Estates Court—Appointment of a Second Judge, Questions, Dr. Ward, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Mar* 16, [228] 70

Law Appointments—Case of James Devine, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 29, [229] 1349

Licensing Act (Ireland) 1872 — *Publicans' Sign-boards*, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 24, [228] 561

[See title *Ireland—Public Houses—Sunday Closing*]

Magistrates—Speech at an Orange Meeting, Question, Observations, Mr. Fay; Reply, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; short debate thereon *May* 5, [229] 165

Registry of Deeds (Dublin), Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 23, [229] 1117;—*Deeds Office, Registry of—The Report*, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 27, [228] 621;—*Legislation*, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 26, [230] 418;—*Mr. Dillon's System*, Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 6, 1045 Report on—*P.P.* 425

Sheriffs—Retention of Levies, Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 16, [229] 773

The Irish Judicial Bench—Mr. Serjeant Armstrong, Questions, Mr. Callan; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 7, [230] 1140; *July* 10, 1175

Union of Legal Offices, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 10, [227] 1800

Criminal Law

Canvassing Jurors, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 27, [230] 1974

Case of James Timony, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 3, [230] 853

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Criminal Law*—cont.

Constabulary, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 24, [230] 1808;—*Case of James Brannigan*, Question, Mr. Benjamin Whitworth; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 21, [227] 560

Convict Prisons, Question, Mr. French; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 30, [230] 736 22nd Report [1472]

Crime in Ireland—Returns, Question, Mr. Herbert; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 20, [228] 266

Kerry Assizes, Question, Mr. Herbert; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 23, [228] 470

The Convict Kirwan, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 3, [231] 424

Trial of Claffey, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *August* 10, [231] 974

Legislation

Bankruptcy Jurisdiction, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 14, [227] 2012

Civil Bill Courts (Ireland) Bill, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Feb* 29, [227] 1124

County Prisons, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 20, [229] 1423

Grand Jury System, Question, Mr. Moore; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 18, [227] 483

Loans, Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 22, [230] 261

Lunatic Asylums—Ex-officio Governors, Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 25, [229] 1193

Municipal Privileges Bill and the Board of Works—Signature of Petitions, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 25, [227] 928

National Museum and Institute of Science and Art for Ireland, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 24, [230] 1808

[See title *Ireland—Royal Irish Academy*]

227] *Owners of Land—Irish "Domesday" Book*, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Observations, Mr. John Bright *Mar* 2, 1208; Question, Mr. John Bright; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 10, 1798; Question, Observations, The Earl of Belmore; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short
230] debate thereon *July* 4, 943; Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 6, 1047

Parl. Papers—

Return	412
Summary	422
Return	[1492]

Papal Authority in Ireland, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 4, [230] 948

Parliamentary Boroughs — Boundaries — A Royal Commission, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 1, [228] 1906

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1871—*County of Meath*, Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 21, [227] 561;—*Proclaimed Districts*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 14, 2012;—*Louth*, Questions, Mr. Callan; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 20, [228] 271; *July* 20, [230] 1627;—*North Riding of Tipperary*, Question, Mr. O'Callaghan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 29, [228] 770;—*Co. Mayo*, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 28, 1830

[See title *Ireland—Peace Preservation Acts*]

Phœnix Park (Dublin), Questions, Mr. Butt, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 10, [231] 973;—*Whitefield Lodge*, Questions, Mr. Butt; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 11, 1072; *August* 14, 1200

Poor Law—Clifden Union, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 12, [229] 487;—*Kilmacthomas Workhouse*, Question, Mr. Arthur Moore; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 7, [228] 1404;—*South Dublin Workhouse*, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 24, [230] 1812;—*Union Workhouses*, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 4, [231] 515

Public Health—City of Dublin, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 4, [228] 1179; Question, Mr. O'Leary; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 1, 1910;—*Drumandra*, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 15, [231] 1230;—*Vaccine Lymph*, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 28, [227] 1021

St. Stephen's Green, Dublin, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 29, [230] 612; Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 25, 1882

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sundays, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 29, [227] 1121

Sunday Drinking—Return, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 6, [227] 1418

The Irish Church

Irish Church Act, Sec. 25—*Irish National Monuments*, Question, Lord Talbot De Malahide; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *July* 24, [230] 1766

Irish Church Temporalities Commission—National Monuments, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 7, [231] 693

Irish Church Body—Emly Cathedral Church, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 25, [230] 1884;—*Sale of Ecclesiastical Edifices*, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *July* 27, [230] 1973

Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Church Lands, Question, Mr. Fay; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 3, [227] 1292

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

The Thurles Coronership, Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 22, [230] 247

The Upper Shannon, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 10, [230] 1171;—*Ballyconnell Canal*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 22, [229] 1035

Training Ships, Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. A. Egerton *July* 6, [230] 1049

Ireland—An Irish Parliament

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 30, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the nature, the extent, and the grounds of the demand made by a large proportion of the Irish people for the restoration to Ireland of an Irish Parliament, with power to control the internal affairs of that Country" (*Mr. Butt*) *v.*, [230] 738; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 291, N. 61; M. 230

Division List, A. and N., 819

Ireland—Blackwater Fishery

Moved, "That, without desiring to infringe upon private rights of several fishery in the Blackwater, this House is of opinion that it is the duty of the Government to watch over and protect the rights of the public in respect to fishery in the tidal waters of that and other Irish rivers" (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*) *July* 11, [230] 1332; after short debate, [House counted out]

Ireland—Borough Franchise

Moved, "That the restricted nature of the Borough Franchise of Ireland as compared with that existing in England and Scotland is a subject deserving the best attention of Parliament, with a view of establishing a fair and just equality of the Franchise in the three Countries" (*Mr. Meldon*) *Mar* 28, [228] 703; after long debate, Question put; A. 166, N. 179; M. 13

Division List, A and N. 763

Ireland—Church Temporalities

Question, The Earl of Leitrim; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *June* 29, [230] 611

Returns ordered—

"(1.) Name of each purchaser of lands sold by the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland;

"(2.) Denomination of land sold, with names of the benefice, county, and barony;

"(3.) The purchase money in each case, distinguishing between the amount paid in cash and the amount secured by mortgage;

"(4.) The date of each sale;

"(5.) The amount of rent formerly paid for each holding sold;

"So far as the same can be given" (*The Earl of Leitrim*)

Return . . . . *P.P. l.* 203

Report of Commissioners . [1400]

Ireland—Common Pleas—Resignation of the Lord Chief Justice

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Letter of Resignation of the late Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Ireland" (*Mr. Butt*) *August* 15, [231] 1231

Ireland—Constabulary Pensioners

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the justice of the claims of the Royal Irish Constabulary Pensioners who retired before the month of August 1874, and to report thereon" (*Mr. Meldon*) *June* 27, [230] 570; after short debate, Question put; A. 3, N. 75; M. 72

Ireland—Grand Juries

Moved, "(1) That no person should be summoned to serve on the grand jury of any county who is not possessed of a fixed property qualification in such county;

"(2) That the grand jury should annually at the summer assizes appoint from amongst their body a committee to represent the grand jury for certain limited purposes;

"(3) That the baronial presentment sessions should be composed of justices of the peace qualified in respect of residence or property in such barony and of the poor law guardians elected to serve for the electoral divisions wholly or partly situate within such barony;

"(4) That the county at large presentment sessions should be composed of persons elected by the several members composing the baronial presentment sessions in such county" (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) *May* 30, [229] 1401; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Ireland—Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the practice which has been permitted of late years in mixing Whiskey in Her Majesty's Bonding and Inland Revenue Stores with other spirits; to report to this House whether the practice is injurious to the public and to the manufacturers of Irish Whiskey, and whether, in the opinion of the Committee, the practice ought or ought not to be discontinued; and that the Committee do also inquire into the effect of using new made spirits, and to report whether it would be in the interest of the public for the Government to detain all spirits and Whiskey in Bond until it is at least twelve months old" (*Mr. O'Sullivan*) *April* 4, [228] 1185

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the practice of 'blending' Whiskey does not necessarily cause adulteration, and it is inexpedient to deprive traders in British spirits of trade facilities that are allowed to traders in Foreign spirits, wines, and various other bonded articles" (*Mr. Anderson*) *v.*; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 69, N. 145; M. 76

[*cont.*

Ireland—Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey—cont.

Question proposed, "That the words 'in the opinion of this House, the practice of 'blending' Whiskey does not necessarily cause adulteration, and it is inexpedient to deprive traders in British spirits of trade facilities that are allowed to traders in Foreign spirits, wines, and various other bonded articles,' be added, *v.*;" Amendt. withdrawn

Ireland—Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Returns of the names of the Valuators who have fixed the amount of the purchase money payable to the Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners on sales by them of the fee-simple to the Tenants holding under them" [with particulars set forth] (*Mr. Fay*) *Mar* 28, [228] 766; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

The Church Funds, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 7, [228] 1403

Ireland—Irish Political Prisoners

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House the time has come when Her Majesty's gracious pardon may be advantageously extended to the prisoners, whether convicted before the civil tribunals or by courts martial, who are and have been for many years undergoing punishment for offences arising out of insurrectionary movements connected with Ireland" (*Mr. O'Connor Power*) *August* 1, [231] 285; after long debate, Question put; A. 51, N. 117; M. 66

Ireland—Land Tenure

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She may be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the state of Land Tenure in Ireland and the condition of the occupiers of land" (*The O'Donoghue*) *August* 14, [231] 1223

Ireland—Local Government and Taxation of Towns

Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the operation in Ireland of the following Statutes: 9 Geo. 4, c. 82, 3 and 4 Vic. c. 108, and 17 and 18 Vic. c. 103, and the Acts altering and amending the same; and to report whether any and what alterations are advisable in the Law relating to Local Government and Taxation of cities and towns in that part of the United Kingdom" (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *Mar* 16

And, on *Mar* 31, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Michael Hicks-Beach (Chairman), Mr. Assheton, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Bruen, Mr. Butt, Mr. Collins, Mr. James Corry, Mr. Gibson, Sir Arthur Guinness, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Charles Lewis, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Murphy, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Rathbone, Dr. Ward

Report of Select Comm. *July* 11 (No. 352)

[*cont.*

Ireland—Local Government and Taxation of Towns—cont.

Select Committee on Local Taxation (Ireland)—Valuation, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 11, [231] 1078

Ireland—National Education

Moved, "That there be laid before the House, Copies of all Correspondence between the Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland with the Commissioners of National Education on the subject of the withdrawal of the commission allowed to teachers of National Schools in Ireland on the purchase of books and requisites in the years 1874 and 1875; also for a Return of the amount of commission allowed in each of the years 1873-4, 1874-5, and 1875-6" (*The Viscount Gough*) *June* 26, [230] 392; after short debate, Motion withdrawn:—Then

Return of the amount of commission allowed to teachers of national schools in Ireland on the purchase of books and requisites in each of the years 1873-74, 1874-75, and 1875-76; Ordered (*The Viscount Gough*)

Return—*P.P. l.* 239

Ireland—National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 17, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, 'The National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875,' having failed to satisfy the just demands of the Teachers, particularly of those in non-contributory unions, the claims of the Irish National School Teachers deserve the immediate attention of Parliament, with a view of substantially and permanently increasing their salaries, and securing to them pensions upon retirement from old age or ill health" (*Mr. Meldon*) *v.*, [228] 225; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 2, 1986

[See *Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions*]

Ireland—Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act

Moved, "That this House, while viewing with satisfaction the withdrawal from several counties of Ireland of the proclamations issued under the Peace Preservation Act, is of opinion that the present condition of Ireland does not justify the retention of the powers of that Act over so large a portion of the Country as still remains subject to its provisions" (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*) *April* 4, [228] 1232; after short debate, Previous Question moved (*Mr. Parnell*); Previous Question put, "That that Question be now put;" resolved in the negative

Ireland—Phœnix Park (Dublin)—Whitefield Lodge

Moved for "Copies of any Correspondence between the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland on the subject of letting Whitefield Lodge,

[*cont.*

Ireland—Phœnix Park (Dublin)— Whitefield Lodge—cont.
Phœnix Park" (*Mr. Butt*) *August* 14, [231] 1222 ; Motion agreed to
Copies ordered, "of any Correspondence between the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland on the subject of letting Whitefield Lodge in the Phœnix Park :"
"Of any Minutes of the Commissioners of Public Works relating thereto :"
"Of the advertisement offering the lands for letting :"
"And, of any proposals made for the taking of the house and lands"

Ireland—Poor Law Rating
Moved, "That the system of Poor Law Rating in Ireland should be assimilated to that of England by the adoption of Union Rating" (*Mr. O'Shaughnessy*) *May* 16, [229] 837 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Ireland—Public-Houses—Sunday Closing
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 12; To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Law which forbids the general sale of Intoxicating Liquors during a portion of Sunday in Ireland should be amended so as to apply to the whole of that day" (*Mr. Richard Smyth*) *v.*, [229] 492 ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after long debate, Question put ; A. 167, N. 224 ; M. 57
Division List, A. and N., 580
Words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Questions, Mr. R. Smyth ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 18, [229] 920 ; *May* 26, 1275

Ireland—Royal Irish Academy
Moved, "That there be laid before the House, Copies of all public official correspondence, commencing 8th February 1876, between the Irish Government, the Treasury, the Science and Art Department, the Royal Dublin Society, and the Royal Irish Academy on the subject of the proposed establishment of a Science and Art Museum in Liverpool" (*The Lord O'Hagan*) *June* 27, [230] 489 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Question, Mr. Sullivan ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 24, 1808
(*Parl. P. l.* 240)

Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker)
Moved, "That the punishment inflicted on Mr. John Croker, late Sub-Inspector in the Royal Irish Constabulary, by reduction in rank in 1867 and subsequent dismissal from that force, for offences of which he declared himself to be innocent, without first affording him an opportunity of proving his innocence before an independent tribunal, was not just ; and, in the opinion of the House, such opportunity ought now to be given" (*Mr. Bruen*) *May* 30, [229] 1434 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Parnell, Mr. Fay*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 10 [Bill 103]
2R. [Dropped]

Irish Peerage Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Inchiquin*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª *Mar* 17, [228] 169 (No. 32)
Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 4, 1162
Committee *May* 1, 1894 (No. 65)
Report *May* 8, [229] 189 (No. 75)
Read 3ª * *May* 9
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. Gibson*) *May* 15 [Bill 149]
Read 2° * *May* 17
Committee *—R.P. *May* 24
Committee—R.P. *August* 12, [231] 1189
Committee (Progress) [Dropped]

Isaac, Mr. S., *Nottingham*
Elementary Education Act, 1870 — Clause 6, [229] 1188
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1293 ; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1498

Isle of Man (Officers) Bill
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 29 [Bill 215]
Read 2° * *July* 6
Committee *—R.P. *July* 7
Committee *—R.P. *July* 10
Committee * ; Report *July* 11
Read 3° * *July* 13
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *July* 14
Read 2ª * *July* 27 (No. 174)
Committee * ; Report *July* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 31
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 43]

Italy
Case of Mr. William Mercer, Question, Sir William Stirling Maxwell ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 10, [230] 1172
Murder of Mr. Hind, near Naples, Question, Sir William Stirling Maxwell ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 22, [227] 684

Italy and Malta—Commercial Treaty
Question, Mr. Potter ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 11, [229] 367

Jackson, Sir H. M., *Coventry*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 1160
Barristers and Advocates Fees, 2R. Amendt. [229] 316
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, [230] 1675, 1719
England and Wales—New "Domesday Book," [229] 1972
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1019
Prisons, 2R. [230] 906
Public Health—Solihull Sanitary Authority, [229] 1973
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1318

[*cont.*

Jamaica—Mr. P. A. Smith, District Judge
Question, Mr. Richard ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 20, [230] 1622

JAMES, Sir H., *Taunton*
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [229] 1693 ; Comm. [230] 982 ; *cl.* 6, 1161, 1162 ; [231] 762 ; Consid. 861 ; *add. cl.* 869
Commons, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1573
Fugitive Slaves—Circulars, Res. [227] 741, 743
228] Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, 547, 550, 891 ; *cl.* 4, 910 ; *cl.* 5, 1154, 1156 ; Amendt. 1157, 1159 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1374, 1377 ; Amendt. 1588, 1617 ; *cl.* 17, 1804 ; *cl.* 18, 1879 ; *cl.* 19, 1881 ; *add. cl.* 1925, 1941, 1948
229] 65, 233 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1059
Navy—Captain Sulivan, Res. [230] 1327
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 404, 407
Pollution of Rivers, 3R. [231] 558
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 12, [229] 1596
Post Office—Female Clerks in the Savings Banks Department, [228] 1179
Royal Titles Act, [228] 1982
Royal Titles Act Proclamation, Notice of Res. [229] 51 ;—Vote of Censure, Res. 370, 374, 376, 391, 395, 405
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [227] 1848 ; [229] 1326, 1327
Convict Establishments, England and the Colonies, [228] 592
New Courts of Justice and Offices, [229] 1591, 1593
Report, Amendt. [227] 996
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1759
United States — Winslow Extradition Case, [228] 1909 ; [229] 1668

JAMES, Mr. W. H., *Gateshead*
City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1117
Criminal Law — Sentences, Disproportioned, [227] 1709
Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), 2R. [229] 1662
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1840
Liverymen (City of London), Motion for a Return, [228] 1816
Local Light Dues (Reduction), [229] 1963
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 1586
Metropolis—New Public Offices — Site, [229] 1350
Public Offices and Improvements, [227] 402
Parliament—Derby Day, [229] 1275
Parliamentary Franchise—Liverymen of London, [228] 1321
Public Health — Vaccination Acts — Joseph Abel, Case of, [231] 1155
Royal Titles, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 157
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 512
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [227] 1839
Lord Privy Seal, [227] 502

Japan and Corea
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 14, [227] 2014 ; Question, Mr. Pender ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 22, [229] 1039

Japan—Newspaper Regulations
Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke ; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 23, [228] 478 ; *April* 10, 1473

JENKINS, Mr. D. J., *Penryn, &c.*
Administration of the Navy, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 456
Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1837
Merchant Service Officers, Res. [229] 801
227] Merchant Shipping, 2R. 465
228] Comm. 529 ; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 906, 908 ; *cl.* 5, 1156 ; *cl.* 6, 1368 ; *cl.* 14, 1583 ; *cl.* 15, 1612 ; *cl.* 18, 1805, 1809 ; *add. cl.* 1935
229] 70, 74 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1062
231] Lords Amendts. Consid. 1178, 1183
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
H.M.S. "Caledonia"—The "Lion" Training Ship, 1602
H.M.S. "Thunderer"—Explosion, [230] 1525
H.M.S. "Vanguard," [228] 270 ; [229] 1194
Post Office—Telegraphs in Small Towns, [228] 1833

JENKINS, Mr. E., *Dundee*
Army—Captain Roberts, 94th Regiment, [229] 1970, 1971 ; [230] 9
Barbadoes—Riots, The—Governor Hennessy, [229] 157
Social and Political Condition, [231] 42
Canada, Dominion of—Treaty of Washington, [228] 1407, 1408
Copyright Commission, [228] 64
Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 6, Motion for Adjournment, [230] 1516
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1207 ; *add. cl.* 1894, 1895, 2005 ; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 536, 548
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 885
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1386
228] Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 6, Motion for Adjournment, 1160 ; *cl.* 14, 1583, 1588 ; *cl.* 16, Motion for reporting Progress, 1800, 1803 ; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1880 ; *add. cl.* 1938
229] Consid. *add. cl.* 1060 ; *cl.* 11, 1069 ; *cl.* 18, 1073 ; Amendt. 1075
231] Lords Amendts. Consid. Motion for Adjournment, 1184
Parliament—Relevancy of Debate—Appropriation Bill, [231] 1158, 1162
Parliament, Acts of—Report of Select Committee, Res. [228] 576
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1860
Poor Law Amendment (Scotland), [230] 1049
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 296
Turkey—Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [231] 1118, 1119
Eastern Question, [230] 873, 874, 875 ; Motion for Adjournment, 876, 882 ;—Papers, 1174 ;—Official Declaration, 1813, 1814
Washington, Treaty of — Canadian Fishery Commission, [230] 257
West African Settlements — Cession of the Gambia, [228] 272

Jenkinson, Sir G. S., *Wiltshire, N.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 971
Merchant Shipping, Consid. *add. cl.* [229] 1061, 1274

Jersey, Earl of
Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Comm. [230] 1520

Jervis, Colonel H. J. W., *Harwich*
East India Revenue Accounts, [231] 1054
Elementary Education Act — London School Board, [229] 206
India—Miscellaneous Questions
  Army—Arrears of Pay, [231] 417 ;—Return, 698
  Furlough and Retiring Regulations, [231] 5
  Majors of Artillery—Royal Warrant, 1872, [228] 1625
  Royal Artillery, [228] 1322
India Office Return, [231] 698

Johnston, Mr. W., *Belfast*
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 272
National School Teachers (Ireland)—Michael Moyna, Case of, [230] 421

Johnstone, Sir H., *Scarborough*
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [230] 1556, 1615
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Res. [229] 1286
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment), Leave, [227] 199, 200
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) (No. 2), 2R. [228] 1886, 1891 ; [229] 753
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1375

Johnstone, Captain J. J. Hope-, *Dumfriesshire*
Poor Law (Scotland), [231] 1204

Judicature Acts—The Official Referees—Mr. Verey
Vote in Supply *May* 26, [229] 1311 ; Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £144,025, be granted to complete the sum for Salaries and Expenses of Chancery Division of High Court of Justice"
Moved to reduce the Vote by £1,700 (*Mr. Waddy*)
Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £142,325, be granted, &c. ;" after debate, Question put, and negatived

Juries (Dublin) Bill
(*The Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Motion for Leave *August* 5, [231] 664 ; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); Question put, and agreed to ; Debate adjourned
Order for resuming Adjourned Debate discharged *August* 10

Juries Procedure (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 7 [Bill 126]
Read 2° * *May* 29
Committee * ; Report *May* 30
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 20 [Bill 176]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 27
Read 3° * *July* 28 [Bill 261]
Lords Amendts. [Bill 293]
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *July* 31 (No. 196)
Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 4, [231] 496
Committee * *August* 7
Report * *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 78]

Jurors Qualification (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 7 [Bill 127]
Read 2°, after short debate *June* 12, [229] 1753
230] Committee—R.P. *June* 20, 141
Committee ; Report *June* 22, 268
Considered ; read 3°, after short debate *June* 23, 338
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 23 (No. 140)
Read 2ª * *June* 26
Committee * ; Report *June* 27
Read 3ª * *June* 29
Royal Assent *June* 30 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 21]

Jurors Remuneration Bill
(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Joseph Cowen*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 12 [Bill 246]
2R. [Dropped]

Kavanagh, Mr. A. M., *Carlow Co.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2049
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [227] 769, 787
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 772
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 643
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1171
National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, Res. [228] 234
Poor Law Rating (Ireland), Res. [229] 840
Royal Naval College, Greenwich—Examinations, [227] 1864

Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. U. J., *Hastings*
Artizans Dwellings, [229] 1668
City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1138
Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 959 ; 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1959 ; [230] 16 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1294 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1451 ; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1498
Metropolitan Board of Works—Returns, [230] 852
Metropolitan Street Improvements Act, 1872, [229] 364

Kenealy, Dr. E. V., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
Criminal Law—Lewis, Platt, and Lancaster, Cases of—Remission of Sentence, [231] 115, 697
Tichborne Claimant, [227] 1712
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [227] 439; Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 657
Merchant Shipping Acts—Grain-Laden Vessels, [227] 1024
Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 329
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1839
Royal Titles, 2R. [227] 1758
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 430
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 337
Tichborne Case—Queen v. Castro—Witnesses, [228] 250
Turkey—Eastern Question, [230] 882

Kennard, Colonel E. H., *Lymington*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1464

Kennaway, Sir J. H., *Devon, E.*
Agricultural Holdings (England) Act—Stamps, [228] 63
China, Res. [230] 569
Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 953; Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1840
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 347, 352
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 982, 1001
Prisons, 2R. [230] 895
Public Health Act, 1875—Local Board Elections, [228] 969
Slave Trade—Sultan of Zanzibar, [230] 249
Slave Trade (East Africa), Res. [228] 1216

Kimberley, Earl of
Africa, West Coast of—Exchange of Territory, [227] 394
Barbadoes, Island of—Reported Disturbances, [228] 1827
Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 629
Cattle Diseases (England and Ireland)—Privy Council Regulations, [227] 129
Commons, 2R. [230] 1036; Comm. *cl.* 8, 1428; Amendt. 1429
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 108, 118, 119, 120
Fiji, Motion for Papers, [230] 1690, 1691
Heligoland, Address for Papers, [227] 1855
Malay Peninsula, Address for Papers, [227] 1017; Res. [230] 842
Mauritius, Coolie Trade in the—The Royal Commission, [229] 474
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1472
Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 872
Saint Vincent, Tobago, and Grenada Constitution, 2R. [230] 1039
Sweden — Stockholm, Episcopal Church at, [229] 1888
Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 762
United States—Extradition, Address for Correspondence, [230] 1794
University of Oxford, Comm. [228] 821; *cl.* 4, 934; *cl.* 12, 939; *cl.* 14, 944, 945; *cl.* 19, 1308, 1309; *cl.* 33, 1314; *cl.* 35, 1315
West Coast of Africa—Dahomey, King of, [229] 768

Kingscote, Lieut.-Colonel R. N. F., *Gloucestershire, W.*
Army—Forage Allowances, [228] 1835
Lieutenant Colonels of Depôt Battalions, [228] 1836
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2050

Kingstown Harbour Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *April* 26 [Bill 136]
Read 2°* *May* 4
Committee*; Report *May* 26
Read 3°* *May* 29
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *May* 30
Read 2ª* *June* 20 (No. 103)
Committee* *June* 22
Report* *June* 23
Read 3ª* *June* 26
Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 95]

Kinnaird, Hon. A. F., *Perth*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 23
Fiji Islands—Epidemic, [227] 1023
Game Laws (Scotland), [227] 1864
Post Office—American Transatlantic Mails, [228] 268

Kirk, Mr. G. H., *Louth*
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 782
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1346

Knatchbull-Hugessen, Right Hon. E. H., *Sandwich*
Africa, West Coast of—Gambia, The—Exchange of Territory, [227] 133
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1334
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1934
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1704, 1896, 1906
Endowed Schools—Assistant Masters, [229] 1420
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 363
Parliament—Public Business, [230] 1912
Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 328
Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1420, 1449
Queenborough Harbour, 3R. [229] 1970
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1598
South Eastern Railway, 2R. [227] 1706; [228] 60

Knight, Mr. F. W., *Worcestershire, W.*
Commons, Comm. [229] 1236; *cl.* 12, 1533; *add. cl.* 1576
Poor Law Rating (Ireland), Res. [229] 839

KNIGHTLEY, Sir R., *Northamptonshire, S.*
Prisons, Leave, [229] 1549

KNOWLES, Mr. T., *Wigan*
Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 48; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1294; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1400, 1403, 1408; *cl.* 33, 1511; *add. cl.* [231] 64
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1169
Supply, Report, [227] 995

LACON, Sir E., *Norfolk, N.*
Corrupt Practices at Elections Act—Yarmouth Election, [229] 1896

LAING, Mr. S., *Orkney, &c.*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 24
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 729; Comm. 969
India—Malay Peninsula—Birch, Mr., Murder of, [229] 1299
Post Office—Telegraphs—Orkney and Shetland Islands, [229] 1418
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1597
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 115
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 641
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1131

Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Crawford, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Thomas Dickson, Mr. Macartney*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 40]
2R.; after short debate, Debate adjourned *June* 21, [230] 224
Bill withdrawn* *July* 5

Land Tenure (Ireland) Bill
(*Dr. Ward, Mr. Butt, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Ennis*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 10]
Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Mr. Butt *Feb* 24, [227] 817
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 29, [228] 771
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Clive*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c."
After long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Law*); Debate adjourned
Observations, Mr. Butt; Reply, Mr. Disraeli; short debate thereon *April* 11, 1559
Question, Mr. George Clive; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 26, [229] 1274
Debate resumed *June* 29, [230] 624; after long debate, Question put; A. 56, N. 290; M. 234
Division List, A. and N. 713
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

LANSDOWNE, Marquess of
Army—Martini-Henry Rifle, [227] 669
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. [230] 105; *cl.* 3, 118
Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, [228] 1393
National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, [229] 355, 359, 362
University of Oxford, Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [228] 937; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 947, 954; *cl.* 16, 1306; *cl.* 25, 1312
University of Oxford—Commissioners, [228] 261

LAUDERDALE, Earl of
Africa—West Coast of—Exchange of Territory, [227] 397
Fugitive Slaves — The Circulars — Petition, [227] 1564
Iron-clads, Motion for Returns, [227] 1863
Mercantile Marine — Training Ships, [227] 1789, 1792
Navy—Chain Cables and Anchors, [227] 547

LAW AND JUSTICE
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Bankruptcy Laws—Legislation, Question, Mr. Bell; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 14, [227] 2013
Case of Mr. R. G. Wilberforce, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 22, [227] 675
County Court Holidays, Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 10, [228] 1473
Irish Ante-Union Statutes, Question, Mr. P. Smyth; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *May* 1, [228] 1911
Judges' Chambers—Admission of Reporters, Question, Mr. Watkin Williams; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 18, [227] 479

Judicature Acts, The
Abolition of the Home Circuit, Question, Observations, Viscount Midleton; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *Feb* 18, [227] 475
The Surrey Assizes, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 15, [227] 302
The Court of Appeal, Observations, Question, Lord Selborne: Answer, The Lord Chancellor *May* 26, [229] 1269
The Eleventh Rule, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 30, [229] 1422
Official Referees, Question, Mr. Waddy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 15, [227] 302; Question, Mr. Waddy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 16, [229] 774; Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 30, 1419; —*Fees*, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 24, [230] 1817
The Summer Circuits, Question, Mr. Cole; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 18, [229] 921; Question, Mr. Cole; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 25, 1187

[*cont.*

LAW AND JUSTICE—*cont.*

Cave v. Mackenzie, Observations, Question, Lord Selborne; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *July* 27, [230] 1951; Explanation, Lord Coleridge *July* 28, [231] 1
Issues of Fact in Chancery, Questions, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Marten; Answers, The Attorney General *July* 24, [230] 1816
Jurymen, Question, Mr. Lopes; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 18, [227] 480
The Judges on Circuit, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 27, [230] 1967
Untried Prisoners—Winter Assizes, Question, Mr. Ryder; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 12, [229] 488 (*Parl. P.* 171)
Jury Law—Legislation, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 21, [227] 554
"*Kimberley v. Crossley*"—*Costs*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Sherlock; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 31, [228] 964
Legal Departments Commission, 1874—*The Report*, Question, Observations, Lord Frederick Cavendish; Reply, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 10, [227] 1837
Money Market—Bubble Companies, Fraudulent Practices, &c.—*Legislation*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 24, [227] 810
Public Prosecutors—Legislation, Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 21, [227] 556
Responsibility of Trustees—Edmunds v. Edmunds, Question, Observations, The Earl of Belmore; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *April* 4, [228] 1176
Summary Administration of Justice, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 24, [227] 811
The Irish Judicial Bench—Mr. Serjeant Armstrong, Questions, Mr. Callan; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 7, [230] 1140; *July* 10, 1175
The Queen's Proctor, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 11, [231] 1075
The Yorkshire Magistracy, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 6, [230] 1044
Trade Union Act, 1871—*Legislation*, Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 22, [227] 678
Union of Legal Offices (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. C. Lewis; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 10, [227] 1800

Law and Justice—Case of Mr. Wilberforce
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is not desirable that Reginald Garton Wilberforce, esquire, should continue on the Bench of Magistrates" (*Mr. P. A. Taylor*) *May* 2, [228] 2008; after debate, Question put; A. 19, N. 100; M. 81

Law Courts, The New—The Architect's Commission
Question, Mr. Mellor; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *July* 4, [230] 948

LAW, Right Hon. H., *Londonderry Co.*
Clerk of the Peace and of the Crown (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1338
Equity Courts (Ireland)—Lord Justice Christian, Personal Explanation, [227] 2015
Irish Ante-Union Statutes, [227] 2015
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 144, 269, 271, 272
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 818; [230] 624
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1178
National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, Res. [228] 234
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1767
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 526, 528
Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 31
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1755; Comm. [230] 350, 364

LAWRENCE, Lord
Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [228] 166
India—Indian Tariff, [227] 1996
Malay Peninsula, Res. [230] 844
Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 847; Comm. 1091
Slave Trade, Comm. *cl.* 1, [230] 850

LAWRENCE, Sir J. C., *Lambeth*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 8, [229] 1211

LAWRENCE, Sir J. J. T., *Surrey, Mid*
China—Yunnan Mission, [228] 1479
Dog Poisoning, [228] 1635
India—Ameer of Kashgar, The, [228] 270

LAWSON, Sir W., *Carlisle*
Army Estimates, Res. [227] 1439
Fiji Islands—Disturbances, [230] 1174
Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1200, 1208
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 891, 901
Parliament—Derby Day, [229] 1426
  Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1639
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1864
Police—Devonport Watch Committee, [229] 263
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [231] 424; Motion for Adjournment, 426, 437

LEATHAM, Mr. E. A., *Huddersfield*
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1380
China, Papers relating to, [227] 1798
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 577
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] *1675, 1688, 1692

Leeds, Duke of (*Schomberg's*) *Pension—Commutation*
Vote in Supply—Objected to; after debate, agreed to, [231] 755

LEEMAN, Mr. G., *York*
Commons, Leave, [227] 197; Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1397; Consid. [230] 132
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1590

LEFEVRE, Mr. G. J. Shaw, *Reading*
Army—Increased Pay of the Soldiers, [227] 1295
Pay of Soldiers and Marines, [227] 1774
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1475
Church Bodies (Gibraltar)—The Ordinances, Motion for an Address, [228] 769
227] Commons, Leave, 195, 197; 2R. Amendt. 525
229] Comm. 241, 1250, 1382, 1384; *cl.* 2,
. 1389; Amendt. 1394, 1397, 1398; *cl.* 4,
. 1524; *cl.* 7, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 8, 1525, 1528,
. 1530, 1531; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1532, 1533,
. 1535; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1556, 1560; *cl.* 20,
. Amendt. 1561; *cl.* 22, 1562; *cl.* 25, 1564;
. *cl.* 28, 1566; *add. cl.* 1567, 1568, 1569,
. 1570, 1574
230] Consid. 131, 132, 134, 136; Amendt. 137
231] Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. 774
Coroners, Res. [230] 1309
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [231] 1150
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* Amendt. [230] 1909, 1977; [231] 10, 22, 23; Consid. *add. cl.* 472; 3R. 572
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1171
Fiji—Epidemic, [231] 255, 256
227] Merchant Shipping, Leave, 184
228] Comm. 525; *cl.* 3, 549, 650, 901; *cl.* 4,
. 910, 911; *cl.* 5, 1153, 1159; *cl.* 9, 1370;
. *cl.* 14, 1375; *cl.* 15, 1598, 1614; *cl.* 16,
. 1795; *cl.* 19, 1881; *cl.* 24, 1913; *cl.* 28,
. 1918; *add. cl.* 1928, 1947
229] 66, 67, 70, 225; Consid. *add. cl.* 1058;
. *cl.* 11, 1068, 1069; 3R. 1335
231] Lords Amendts. Consid. 1168, 1178
Navy—Coast Guard Services, [229] 257
Naval Cadets, [227] 816
Royal Marines—Increase of Pay, [227] 1717
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [230] 469
Men and Boys, &c. [227] 1939
Seamen and Marines, [228] 1528, 1548
Plumstead and Wormholt Commons, Res. [231] 830
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1772
Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 338
Civil Service Commission, [227] 513
Navy Excess of Expenditure, [228] 341

Legal Practitioners Bill
(*Mr. Charley, Mr. William Gordon*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 43]
2R. [House counted out] *July* 21, [230] 1764
Read 2°* *August* 5
Committee *—R.P. *August* 7
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Considered *; read 3° *August* 9
l. Read 1ª* (*Viscount Hutchinson*) *August* 10
Read 2ª* *August* 11 (No. 220)
Committee *; Report *August* 12
Read 3ª* *August* 14
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 66]

Legal Practitioners (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Gibson, Mr. Downing*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 3 [Bill 142]
Read 2°* *July* 5
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Read 3°* *July* 12

[*cont.*

Legal Practitioners (Ireland) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*Viscount Hutchinson*) *July* 13
Read 2ª* *July* 17 (No. 170)
Committee * *July* 24
Report * *July* 25
Read 3ª* *July* 27
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 44]

LEGARD, Sir C., *Scarborough*
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [230] 1573
Metropolis—Piccadilly and Grosvenor Place, [227] 406
Oyster Fisheries, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1498
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1729

LEIGH, Lieut.-Colonel Egerton, *Cheshire, Mid*
Army—Commissions, Sale of—Royal Warrant of 1870, [227] 1023
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 953
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1276
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2064
Criminal Law—Women, Aggravated Assaults on, [227] 481
Divorce, Law of, [229] 667
Extradition Treaties, [227] 673
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1002
Noxious Nuisances, Legislation, [227] 405
Public Health—Quack Medicines, [228] 269
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1137

LEIGHTON, Mr. S., *Shropshire, N.*
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1711
Prisons, 2R. [230] 904
Shrewsbury and Holyhead Road, [229] 263

LEITH, Mr. J. F., *Aberdeen*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 6, [231] 768; *cl.* 13, 773
Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 489
India—Indian Budget, [229] 1895
Indian Legislation, 2R. [227] 467
Parliament—Public Business, [229] 1195
Post Office—India, Postage to, [228] 351
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), [227] 264; 2R. [231] 564

LEITRIM, Earl of
Church Temporalities (Ireland), Motion for a Return, [230] 611

LENNOX, Right Hon. Lord H. G. C. G. (First Commissioner of Works), *Chichester*
Army—Volunteer Review in Hyde Park, [230] 501, 622
Edinburgh Improvement, 2R. [230] 243
Law Courts, New — Architect's Commission, [230] 948
Lisbon Tramways Company — Twycross v. Grant, Personal Explanation, [230] 1481

[*cont.*

LENNOX, Lord H. G. C. G. —*cont.*
- Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Cab Shelter in Palace Yard, [229] 48
  - Hyde Park—Rotten Row, State of, [227] 1206; [229] 672; — Serpentine, [227] 1714;—Bathing, [230] 855
  - Hyde Park Corner, [227] 815; [229] 1273, 1274; [230] 858
  - National Gallery, [230] 857;—New Buildings, [229] 1422, 1423;—Turner Pictures, [230] 618
  - New Courts of Justice, [229] 34
  - New Public Offices, Site, [229] 1350
  - Piccadilly and Grosvenor Place, [227] 407
  - Public Offices and Improvements, [227] 403
  - St. James's Park—Lighting the Enclosure, [229] 1664;—Ornamental Water in, 1350
  - Victoria Park, [229] 927
- Metropolis — Hyde Park Corner, Traffic at, Res. [229] 1580
- Ordnance Survey—Civil Assistants, [227] 811
- South Kensington Museum — Art Library, [227] 1567
- Supply—British Embassy Houses, &c. [229] 1595
  - Home and Colonial Offices, New, [229] 1587
  - National Gallery Enlargement, [229] 1588
  - Natural History Museum, [229] 1590
  - New Courts of Justice and Offices, [229] 1591, 1593
  - New Palace at Westminster, Acquisition of Lands and Embankment, [229] 1594
  - Public Buildings, [229] 1585
  - Report, [229] 1757
  - Royal Parks and Gardens, [229] 1583
  - Surveys of the United Kingdom, [229] 1589
  - Wellington Monument, [229] 1590
- Westminster, Palace of—Mr. Herbert's Picture, [229] 1514
  - The Clock Tower, [229] 918

LESLIE, Sir J., *Monaghan*
- Metropolis—National Gallery, [230] 856, 857

LEWIS, Mr. C. E., *Londonderry*
- Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [230] 1158
- Army—Londonderry Militia, [228] 1484
- Barristers and Advocates Fees, 2R. [229] 340
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Bankruptcy Jurisdiction, [227] 2012
  - Deputy Clerks of the Peace, [228] 1096
  - Education—Model Schools, [229] 919
  - Law and Justice—Legal Offices, Union of, [227] 1800
- Ireland—Borough Franchise Res. [228] 718
- Ireland—Constabulary Pensioners, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 572
- Ireland—National School Teachers Act, 1875, Res. [228] 231
- Ireland—Public Houses—Sunday Closing, Res.]229] 562
- Judicature Act, 1873—Official Referees, [229] 1419
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [228] 1948
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [227] 1166, 1174
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Privilege — Monastic and Conventual Institutions, [228] 1318
  - Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 8

[*cont.*

LEWIS, Mr. C. E.—*cont.*
  - Sessional Order, 1875—Strangers, Presence of, [229] 1355, 1555, 1819
- Parliament—Privilege—Political Committee of the Reform Club, Res. [229] 1677
- Privy Council (Oaths taken by Members, &c.), Address for Returns, [228] 2023, 2029, 2030, 2039; — Mr. Lowe's Speech at Retford, Personal Statement, [229] 52
- Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 26
- Royal Titles, [228] 1757;—The Proclamation, 1765
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1135
- Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. Amendt. [228] 1354

LEWIS, Mr. H. O., *Carlow*
- Army Mobilization—Monaghan Militia, [230] 1969

Licensing Act, 1872—*Burial Clubs*
- Questions, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 30, [228] 880; *April* 3, 1099

LIFFORD, Viscount
- Notices to Quit (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [230] 1695

LIMERICK, Earl of
- Forfeiture Relief, 2R. [231] 963
- Irish Peerage, Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1896; *cl.* 6, 1906
- Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [231] 933
- Owners of Land (Ireland)—New "Domesday Book," [230] 944
- Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 763; Comm. [230] 938

Limited Owners Residence (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Patrick O'Brien, Sir Arthur Guinness, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Gibson*)
- c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 26 [Bill 210]
- Bill withdrawn * *July* 24

LINCOLN, Bishop of
- Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 631

LINDSAY, Lord, *Wigan*
- Scotland—Ayr, Fatal Fire in, [230] 419

LINDSAY, Colonel R. J. Loyd, *Berkshire*
- Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 973
- Army Recruiting, Res. [227] 1218

Linen and Hempen and other Manufactures (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
- c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 29 [Bill 216]
- Bill withdrawn * *July* 20

Lisbon Tramways Company—Twycross v. Grant
Personal Explanation, Lord Henry Lennox; short debate thereon *July* 17, [230] 1481

Liverymen (*City of London*) — See title *Parliamentary Franchise*

LLOYD, Mr. M., *Beaumaris*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [230] 984, 1145; *cl.* 6, 1162; Consid. [231] 863; *add. cl.* 879, 883
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1389
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 1589; *cl.* 15, 1613; *cl.* 19, 1880; *add. cl.* 1941; Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 95
Navy—H.M.S. " Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1092
Offences against the Person, 2R. [227] 141; Comm. 334
Owners of Land (England)—New "Domesday Book," [228] 1577
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1774; Consid. Amendt. [230] 480; Amendt. 481
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 156
Supply—New Courts of Justice and Offices, [229] 1592, 1594

LLOYD, Mr. S. S., *Plymouth*
Bankers Books Evidence, 2R. [229] 1597
Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1924
Church Bodies (Gibraltar)—The Ordinances, Motion for an Address, [228] 769
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1572
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [228] 44
Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 962; Comm. [230] 1286; *cl.* 26, 1503; *add. cl.* 2008; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 478
Factory and Workshops Act, [229] 1520
Navy — Royal Marine Light Infantry, [230] 1391; [231] 1069
  Royal Marines, [228] 1518;—Officers of, [227] 683
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [230] 471
  Scientific Departments, [229] 2020
Noxious Vapours—A Royal Commission, [230] 1523
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 855
Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1468
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1343

Loans to Foreign States—The Select Committee—The Honduras Minister
Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 10, [227] 136 *Parl. P.* [1417]

Local Expenditure — Penalty for Non-render of Accounts
Question, Mr. Smyth; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 1, [231] 254

Local Finance
Annual Statement, Question, Mr. Paget; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 29, [227] 1122
Indebtedness of Local Authorities, Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 25, [229] 1185; Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 29, 1353
Local Taxation — Amount and Distribution, Question, Mr. Pell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 15, [229] 669;—*Queenborough*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 13, [230] 1397
  Abstract for 1874-5 (England)—*P.P.* 396

Local Government Act—Harrogate Board of Health
Question, Mr. Mills; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 15, [229] 1896

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artizans and Labourers Dwellings) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 19 (No. 127)
Read 2ª* *June* 26
Committee* *July* 13
Report* *July* 14
Read 3ª* *July* 17
c. Read 1º* (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 20 [Bill 260]
Read 2º* *July* 24
Committee discharged; committed to a Select Committee, to be appointed by the Committee of Selection, as in the case of a Private Bill *August* 1
Report of Select Comm. *August* 7
Committee* (*on re-comm*); Report *August* 8 [Bill 287]
Committee*; Report; Considered; read 3º *August* 11
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccxxxv]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bath, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 19 (No. 126)
Read 2ª* *June* 26
Committee* *July* 17
Report* *July* 18
Read 3ª* *July* 20
Commons Amendts. (No. 215)
c. Read 1º* (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 21 [Bill 264]
Read 2º* *July* 26
Committee*; Report *August* 4
Considered* *August* 7
Read 3º* *August* 10
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cci]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bilbrough, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 22 (No. 137)
Read 2ª* *June* 26

[*cont.*

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bilbrough, &c.) Bill—cont.
Committee * *July* 17
Report * *July* 18
Read 3ª * *July* 20
Commons Amendts. (No. 217)
c. Read 1º * (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 24 [Bill 265]
Read 2º * *July* 27
Committee * ; Report *August* 4
Considered * ; read 3º *August* 8
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cciii]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bingley, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 22 (No. 136)
Read 2ª * *June* 26
Committee * *July* 10
Report * *July* 11
Read 3ª * *July* 13
c. Read 1º * (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 18 [Bill 255]
Read 2º * *July* 20
Committee * ; Report *July* 31
Read 3º * *August* 1
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cxcviii]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 13 (No. 111)
Read 2ª * *June* 20
Committee, after short debate *July* 18, [230] 1519
Report *July* 20, 1618
Read 3ª * *July* 21
Commons Amendts. (No. 216)
c. Read 1º * (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 24 [Bill 266]
Read 2º * *July* 27
Committee * ; Report *August* 4
Considered * *August* 7
Read 3º * *August* 8
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. ccii]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Carnarvon, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 1 (No. 105)
Read 2ª * *June* 20
Committee * ; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *July* 4
c. Read 1º * (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 5 [Bill 239]
Read 2º * *July* 10
Committee * ; Report *July* 18
Read 3º * *July* 20
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clxi]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Chelmsford, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 13 (No. 110)
Read 2ª * *June* 20
Committee * *July* 13
Report * *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 17

[*cont.*

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Chelmsford, &c.) Bill—cont.
c. Read 1º * (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 18 [Bill 256]
Read 2º * *July* 20
Committee * ; Report *July* 31
Read 3º * *August* 1
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cxcix]

Local Government in Towns (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Bruen, Sir Arthur Guinness, Mr. Corry, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Kavanagh*)
c. Ordered ; read 1º * *Feb* 10 [Bill 52]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Local Government Provisional Orders Bill (*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1º * *Mar* 10 [Bill 102]
Read 2º * *Mar* 20
Committee * ; Report *April* 3
Read 3º * *April* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *April* 7 (No. 54)
Read 2ª * *May* 4
Committee * ; Report *May* 5
Read 3ª * *May* 8
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 13]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered * *April* 6
Read 1º * *April* 7 [Bill 122]
Read 2º * *April* 10
Committee * ; Report *April* 24
Read 3º * *April* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Jersey*) *April* 28 (No. 62)
Read 2ª * *May* 8
Committee * ; Report *May* 9
Read 3ª * *May* 11
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 14]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1º * *April* 7 [Bill 125]
Read 2º * *April* 10
Committee * ; Report *April* 24
Read 3º * *April* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Jersey*) *April* 28 (No. 63)
Read 2ª * *May* 8
Committee * ; Report *May* 9
Read 3ª * *May* 11
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 15]

Local Government Provisional Orders (Briton Ferry, &c.) (No. 4) Bill
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1º * *April* 26 [Bill 134]
Read 2º * *April* 28
Committee * ; Report *May* 8
Considered * *May* 11
Read 3º * *May* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Jersey*) *May* 15 (No. 87)
Read 2ª * *May* 23
Committee * ; Report *May* 26
Read 3ª * *May* 29
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 16]

Local Government Provisional Orders (Skelmersdale) (No. 5) Bill
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 26 [Bill 135]
Read 2° * *April* 28
Committee *; Report *May* 8
Considered * *May* 11
Read 3° * *May* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Jersey*) *May* 15 (No. 88)
Read 2ª * *May* 23
Committee *; Report *May* 26
Read 3ª * *May* 29
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 17]

Local Government Provisional Orders (Bristol, &c.) (No. 6) Bill
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 10 [Bill 147]
Read 2° * *May* 15
Committee discharged; committed to a Select Committee, to be appointed by the Committee of Selection, as in the case of a Private Bill *May* 25
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 15
Considered * *June* 16
Read 3° * *June* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Jersey*), and referred to the Examiners *June* 20 (No. 129)
Read 2ª * *June* 26
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Read 3ª * *July* 11
Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 97]

Local Government Provisional Orders, (Aberavon, &c.) (No. 7) Bill
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered * *May* 23
Read 1° * *May* 24 [Bill 164]
Read 2° * *May* 29
Committee *; Report *June* 8
Read 3° * *June* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Jersey*) *June* 13 (No. 108)
Read 2ª * *June* 22
Committee *; Report *June* 26
Read 3ª * *June* 27
Royal Assent *June* 30 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 87]

Local Light Dues (Reduction) Bill
(*Mr. Sykes, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Wilson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 26 [Bill 173]
Read 2° * *June* 12
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 15, [229] 1962; after short debate, Question put; A. 98, N. 23; M. 75
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. Dodds*); after short debate, Question put; A. 10, N. 96; M. 86; Bill reported
Read 3° * *June* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Wharncliffe*) *June* 22 (No. 132)
Read 2ª * *June* 29
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Read 3ª * *July* 11
Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 27]

Local Loans (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Resolution [June 29] reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered * *June* 30
Read 1° * *July* 4 [Bill 231]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 10

LOCKE, Mr. J., *Southwark*
Channel Islands—Jersey—Bailiff of the Royal Court, [228] 351;—Orders in Council, [230] 5, 428, 1622;—Royal Court of, [227] 1120, 1121; [228] 964; [231] 968
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 553
Metropolis — Thames Embankment — High Tides, [230] 1393
Metropolis (Parochial System), Res. [227] 308, 309
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 587
Pollution of Rivers, 3R. [231] 560
Supply—Mint, including Coinage, [227] 524
Thames, Prevention of Floods in the, [227] 1568

LONDON, Bishop of
Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 638
Confession, Motion for a Paper, [230] 1687
Sweden — Stockholm, Episcopal Church at, [229] 1888
Union of Benefices, 2R. [229] 759
University of Oxford, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 941 *cl.* 16, 960, 1305

LOPES, Sir M., *Devonshire, S.*
Greenwich Pensioners in Government Employ, [228] 621
Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [228] 1551
Dockyards, &c. [230] 471
Scientific Departments, [230] 458
Prisons, 2R. [230] 286, 929

LOPES, Mr. H. C., *Frome*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [230] 1147; *cl.* 1, Motion for reporting Progress, 1159
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 4, [229] 1524; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1525, 1528; *add. cl.* 1575
Judicature Acts—Jurymen, [227] 450
Offences against the Person, Comm. [227] 333
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 421

Lords Lieutenant—Choice of Magistrates
Personal Explanation, The Earl of Sandwich; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *August* 3, [231] 365

LOWE, Right Hon. R., *London University*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. *cl.* 13, [231] 885
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [231] 915; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1147; *cl.* 3, Amendt. *ib.*, 1149; *cl.* 5, 1151; *add. cl.* 1152
Egypt—Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Mission, [228] 567; Res. [231] 639, 644;—Mr. Cave's Report, [228] 74
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1468

[*cont.*

Lowe, Right Hon. R.—*cont.*
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1542, 1842 ; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 522, 548
- Exchequer Bonds, 3R. [227] 1436
- India—Nizam State Railway—Loans to Indian Princes, [229] 1346
- Indian Civil Service Competition, [231] 717, 721
- Indian Covenanted Civil Servants, [230] 620
- London Municipal Government, Res. [229] 1806
- Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1636
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [231] 710
- Parliament—Public Petition from a Foreign Town—Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1417
- Privy Council (Oaths taken by Members, &c.) Address for Returns, [228] 2031 ; — Mr. Lowe's Speech at Retford—Personal Statement, [229] 52
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 601
- Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 410, 425 ; Comm. [228] 92 ; *cl.* 1, 285 ; 3R. 513
- Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 831
- Supply — Civil Service Commission, [227] 1103
- Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 563, 616
- Turkey—Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [231] 877
- University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1748

Lowther, Mr. J. (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies), *York City*
- Africa, West Coast of—Miscellaneous Questions
  - African Mail Steamers—Native Labourers, [231] 690
  - Dahomey, Disputes with, [231] 120
  - The Gambia — Exchange of Territory, [227] 133, 684, 1710 ; [228] 272 ;—Acting Administrator of, [231] 118
- Barbadoes—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Flogging in, [228] 1323
  - Governor Hennessy, [229] 158, 265
  - Riots, [228] 1628, 1834 ; [229] 44 ; [230] 1281, 1811 ; [231] 702
  - Social and Political Condition, [231] 48
- British Honduras, [231] 117
- Canada, Dominion of—British Columbia, [230] 871
- China—Blockade Question, [230] 503
  - Hong Kong, Chinese Consul at, [231] 119
- Church Bodies (Gibraltar)—The Ordinances, [228] 66 ; Motion for an Address, 768 ; [230] 1399
- Church of England—Episcopal See of Gibraltar, [231] 1156
- Dahomey — Bombardment, The Threatened, [229] 671
- Fenian Prisoners, Escape of, [229] 1604
- Fiji Islands—Disturbances, [230] 1174
  - Land Question, [231] 1157
  - Papers, [230] 1967
- Gibraltar — Aliens' Order in Council, 1873, [228] 1832 ; [230] 1434
  - Church Endowments in, [227] 225, 262
- India—Malay Peninsula—Birch, Mr., Murder of, [229] 1303 ;—Disturbances in the—Papers, [227] 258
  - Salangore, British Resident in, [229] 1516

[*cont.*

Lowther, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Jamaica—Mr. P. A. Smith, District Judge, [230] 1622
- Malta—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Civilian Government, [229] 1667
  - Commercial Treaty with Italy, [229] 367
  - H.R.H. The Prince of Wales—Nobility of Malta, The, [229] 670, 1667
- Malta, Taxation in, Res. [229] 1985, 1988
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, [228] 352
- Mercantile Marine—Burglaries at Sea, [228] 1835
- Newfoundland Fisheries, [227] 554, 677 ; [228] 1178 ;—French Shore, [229] 667
- Post Office—South Africa, Telegraphic Communication with, [229] 672
- Prince Edward Island—Land Purchase Act, 1875, [227] 559
- River Gambia, Res. [228] 2005
- Saint Vincent—Treatment of Coolies, Motion for an Address, [227] 2075
- Sierra Leone—Financial Position, [229] 1040
- United States—Indian War, [230] 1697
- West Indies—St. Vincent, Island of, [229] 365 ; [230] 1170
- Windward Islands—Disturbances, [229] 367
  - Federation, [228] 1178

Lowther, Mr. W., *Westmoreland*
- Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, Res. [228] 1248

Lubbock, Sir J., *Maidstone*
- Bankers Books Evidence, 2R. [229] 1597 ; Consid. [230] 937
- Barbadoes — Social and Political Condition, [231] 58
- Commons, Leave, [227] 198
- Crossed Cheques, [227] 684
- Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [231] 896 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1148, 1149
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 744 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1198
- Education Code—Subjects, Choice of, Res. [227] 1800, 1812
- Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 51 ; Comm. *cl.* 6, 1404 ; *cl.* 7, 1413, 1414 ; *cl.* 11, 1446 ; *add. cl.* 1999 ; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 491
- Exchequer Bonds, 3R. [227] 1432
- Foreign Loans, Select Committee on—Honduras Minister, [227] 136
- Joint Stock Companies Act — Arrest of an Official Liquidator at Hamburgh, [229] 926
- Maritime Contracts, Leave, [227] 162
- Royal Titles Proclamation, [228] 1774
- Seal Fisheries Act, 1875—Close Time, [230] 1480
- Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 855
- Supply—British Museum, [231] 264

Lucan, Earl of
- Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1117

Lunatics, Committal and Treatment of
- Observations, Mr. Dillwyn *July* 7, [230] 1146 ; [House counted out]

Lush, Dr. J. A., *Salisbury*
Army Medical Department — Examinations, [227] 257
Coroners, Res. [230] 1314
Duke of Schomberg's Pension—Commutation, Res. [231] 757
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 26, [230] 1503
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1009
Poor Law—Bath Board of Guardians, [231] 254
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1775 ; Consid. [230] 504

Lusk, Sir A., *Finsbury*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [230] 1158
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1229 ; Res. 1765
Consolidated Fund, 3R. [228] 566
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1665 ; Consid. *cl.* 8, [231] 475
Maritime Contracts, Leave, [227] 160
Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1832
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 549, 900 ; *cl.* 5, 1155 ; *cl.* 15, 1602 ; Amendt. 1616 ; *cl.* 16, 1802 ; *cl.* 18, 1805 ; *add. cl.* 1935 ; [229] 64, 66, 68, 229 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1064 ; Lords Amendts. Consid. [231] 1178
Metropolis (Parochial System), Res. [227] 309
Navy Estimates — Admiralty Office, [228] 1551
    Seamen and Marines, [228] 1548
Offences against the Person, Comm. [229] 1784
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1774 ; Consid. [230] 504
Supply—Charity Commission, [227] 505
    Chief Secretary for Ireland Offices, [227] 1843
    Civil Service Commission, [227] 511
    Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission, [227] 515
    Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [227] 1842
    Lord Privy Seal, [227] 502
    Mint, including Coinage, [227] 524

McArthur, Mr. A., *Leicester*
Africa—Gold Coast—Case of Messrs. Swanzy, [231] 969
Army—Aldershot, Barracks at, [227] 405
    Soldiers, Accommodation for, [227] 1021
Burial Service—Church of England, [228] 881
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1222 ; *add. cl.* 2018 ; [231] 24, 63
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1286
Gas, Price of, [231] 969
India—Bombay—Tenders for Bills on, [227] 265
Merchant Shipping Acts—Steamer "Marie," [230] 1629
Newfoundland Fisheries, [227] 554
Post Office—Channel Islands—Alderney, [228] 1323
    South Africa, Telegraphic Communication with, [229] 672

McArthur, Mr. Alderman W., *Lambeth*
Africa, West Coast of—Gambia, Acting Administrator of the, [231] 118
Army—Barracks, Accommodation in, [227] 1766
Canada, Dominion of—British Columbia, [230] 870
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [231] 60, 67
Elementary Education Act—Poor Law Relief, [227] 1417
Endowed Schools—Tideswell Grammar School, [229] 1515
India—Indian Gaols, [229] 1515
River Gambia, Res. [228] 1998, 2007
West Africa—Gambia Settlement, [227] 561, 1710

Macartney, Mr. J. W. E., *Tyrone*
Constabulary Pensioners (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 571
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 782
Poor Law (Ireland)—Union Workhouses, [231] 515, 516
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 549
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1351
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 356

MacCarthy, Mr. J. G., *Mallow*
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 5, [230] 1301
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 797
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 973, 974
Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [231] 279

Macdonald, Mr. A., *Stafford*
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1406
Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 64 ; Comm. *cl.* 7, 1417
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1154, 1181
Explosive Substances Act, 1875 — Dynamite, Explosion of, in South Wales, [228] 1831 ; [229] 1190
Factory Acts—Bleachworks and Dyeworks, [228] 1098
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 552
Inland Revenue Department—Extra Pay, [230] 1390
Inland Revenue—Railway Passenger Duty—London, Chatham, and Dover, &c. Railways, [231] 1075
Inland Revenue — Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1600 ; [230] 1474
Jury Laws—Legislation, [227] 554
Merchant Shipping, Comm. [228] 536 ; *cl.* 3, 680 ; *cl.* 15, Motion for reporting Progress, 1619 ; *cl.* 16, 1802 ; *cl.* 24, 1914 ; *add. cl.* [229] 61, 91, 225
Mines—Miscellaneous Questions
    Blasting Powder, [227] 136, 1022, 1797
    Coal Mines—Birley Explosion, [230] 1279 ; —Clifton Hall Colliery Accident, [231] 1074
    Colliery Accidents—Wigan Collieries, [229] 1760
    Reports of Inspectors for 1875, [227] 680

[*cont.*

Macdonald, Mr. A.—*cont.*

Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1677
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. [228] 1470; *cl.* 28, [229] 1768; *add. cl.* 1777
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [228] 1810
Railway Companies—Servants, Dismissal of, [230] 336
Supply—Civil Service Commission, Amendt. [227] 508
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1467
  Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [227] 1842
  Report, Amendt. [227] 995, 996

Macduff, Viscount, *Elgin and Nairn*

Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1617

MacGregor, Mr. D. R., *Leith, &c.*

228] Merchant Shipping, Comm. 536; *cl.* 3, 907; *cl.* 5, 1154, 1158; *cl.* 18, 1804, 1809
229] *add. cl.* 70, 92, 215; Consid. *add. cl.* 1061; *cl.* 4, 1066; *cl.* 11, 1068; *cl.* 18, 1072, 1073; *cl.* 19, 1076; *cl.* 20, Amendt. *ib.*, 1077; 3R. 1335
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 424

Mac Iver, Mr. D., *Birkenhead*

228] Merchant Shipping, Comm. 535; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 544, 550, 665, 893; Motion for reporting Progress, 909; *cl.* 5, 1152; Amendt. 1159; *cl.* 14, 1376, 1585, 1587, 1588; *cl.* 15, 1592, 1604, 1614, 1616, 1621; *cl.* 16, 1794; *cl.* 19, 1881; *cl.* 27, 1917; *add. cl.* 1929, 1947
229] *add. cl.* 56, 66, 67, 70, 215, 219, 226, 234, 235; Consid. *add. cl.* 1057, 1063; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1065; Amendt. 1066; Amendt. 1067; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 1068; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1076; *cl.* 26, Amendt. 1082, 1274
231] Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. 1162, 1175, 1178
Merchant Shipping Act, 1871—"Leader," The Schooner, [230] 855
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 845

McKenna, Sir J. N., *Youghal*

Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland) — Lords Amendts. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 1272
Bankers Deposits — Financial Panics, Res. [229] 778, 794
Bankrupt Banks, 1844-1875—Defective Returns, [230] 129
Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 440
Criminal Law — Pontefract Magistrates — Duggan, Case of, [231] 114
Crossed Cheques, 3R. [231] 1218; Re-comm. *cl.* 12, 1219
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [229] 1376
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1581
Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 493
Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1212

[*cont.*

M'Kenna, Sir J. N.—*cont.*

Ireland—Clerks of the Peace, [230] 851
  Peace Preservation Act—Proclaimed Districts, [227] 2012
Ireland—Blackwater Fishery, Res. [230] 1332
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [228] 717
Ireland—Common Pleas—Resignation of Chief Justice, Motion for a Paper, [231] 1231
Irish Peerage, Consid. Motion for reporting Progress, [231] 1189
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 145, 269, 271
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 549; Motion for Adjournment, 686, 908; *cl.* 5, 1156; *cl.* 14, Motion for reporting Progress, 1376, 1377
Parliament—Business of the Session, [231] 123
Parliamentary Agency, Res. Amendt. [231] 326, 329
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, Res. [228] 1232, 1237, 1247
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 349, 350, 351
Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1468
  Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 619
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1757

Mackintosh, Mr. C. F., *Inverness, &c.*

Elementary Education (Scotland) Act—Scotch Education Code, 1876, [228] 1406
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1634
Post Office—Hebrides, Mails to the, [227] 1868
Sasine Office (Edinburgh), [227] 681

McLagan, Mr. P., *Linlithgowshire*

Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 218
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 11, [230] 1446; *add. cl.* 1911
Explosive Substances Act, 1875 — Railway Companies Bye-Laws, [228] 879
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1606, 1656
Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whisky, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1200
Metropolitan Fire Brigade, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 368
Peru—Guano, [227] 406
Pollution of Rivers, Leave, [229] 1600; 2R. [230] 1878
Scotland—Hypothec, Law of, [227] 135

McLaren, Mr. D., *Edinburgh*

Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 217
Burgesses (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1188; Comm. 1779
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 8, 31, 36, 41
Civil Service—Writers at Customs Out-Ports, [228] 963
Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland), [230] 1048, 1049, 1481
Edinburgh Improvement, 2R. [230] 242
Elementary Education, Consid. *add. cl.* [231] 469, 472; *cl.* 14, 533
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1379

[*cont.*

McLaren, Mr. D.—*cont.*
  Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 330
  Peru—"Talisman," Case of, Res. [231] 755
  Pollution of Rivers, Consid. [231] 284
  Poor Law Amendment, Comm. [228] 1470; *cl.* 28, [229] 1769
  Poor Law (Scotland)—Medical Relief, [228] 1483
  Post Office—Blue Books—Postage of, [228] 1324, 1408
  Prisons (Scotland), [231] 704
  Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1601
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 346, 350
  Sheriff Courts (Scotland), [230] 1623; 2R. [231] 564
  Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 512
    Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1467
    Local Government Board, &c. [227] 516, 517, 520
    Public Education in Scotland, [231] 267
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 360
  Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1940

Maitland, Mr. J., *Kirkcudbrightshire*
  Army—Moncrieff Gun Carriage, [231] 418
  Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 211
  University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1107

Makins, Lieut.-Colonel W. T., *Essex, S.*
  Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. *cl.* 13, [231] 883
  Army Chaplains—Compensation, [229] 1664
  Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 960; 2R. 1927
  Gas Companies Act—Gas Referees, [229] 1110
  Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [230] 1026
  Metropolitan Railway, 2R. [227] 809
  Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1590

Malay Peninsula—The Disturbances at Perak
227] Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 14, 257
  Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for further Correspondence respecting the Malay Peninsula" (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *Feb* 28, 1000; after short debate, on Question? resolved in the negative
  Personal Explanation, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Earl of Carnarvon *Mar* 3, 1283; Question, Mr. Noel; Answer, Mr.
228] Bourke *April* 24, 1577
    Correspondence—*P.P.* [1505, 1510, 1512]

Malmesbury, Earl of (Lord Privy Seal)
  Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. [228] 1382
  Chain Cables and Anchors, [227] 547

Malta
  Civilian Government, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 12, [229] 1666
  Commercial Treaty with Italy, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 11, [229] 367

[*cont.*

Malta—cont.
  H.R.H. the Prince of Wales—The Nobility of Malta, Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Carnarvon *May* 11, [229] 362; Questions, Sir George Bowyer; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 15, 670; *June* 12, 1667
  The Fortifications of Malta, Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr; Reply, Earl Cadogan *June* 27, [230] 487
  The Nobility of Malta—Grievances, Question, Viscount Sidmouth; Answer, The Earl of Carnarvon *June* 16, [229] 1965
    Correspondence . . . . *P.P.* [1582]
    Paper 153

Malta—Taxation on Grain and Cattle
  Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient in policy, and mischievous as an example to other Nations on the shores of the Mediterranean, to continue to levy ten shillings a quarter on wheat imported into the island of Malta, and other high Duties of a protective character on grain and cattle" (*Mr. Potter*) *v.*, [229] 1976; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 130, N. 84; M. 46

Manchester, Duke of
  Africa, West Coast of—Exchange of Territory, [227] 392

Manchester Post Office Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Lord John Manners*)
c. Ordered; read 1o* *Feb* 15 [Bill 72]
  Read 2o, and committed to a Select Committee *Feb* 28, [227] 1104
  And, on Mar 1, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Floyer (Chairman), Mr. Leveson Gower, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Mr. Heygate, and Mr. Kirkman Hodgson nominated by the Committee of Selection
  Report*; Re-comm. *Mar* 9 [Bill 100]
  Committee* (*on re-comm.*)—r.p. *Mar* 13
  Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *Mar* 14
  Considered* *Mar* 15
  Read 3o* *Mar* 16
l. Read 1a* (*Lord President*) *Mar* 17 (No. 33)
  Read 2a* *Mar* 24
  Committee*; Report *Mar* 27
  Read 3a* *Mar* 28
  Royal Assent *April* 7 [39 *Vict.* c. iv]

Manners, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. (Postmaster General), *Leicestershire, N.*
  Fine Arts, Motion for an Address, [229] 303
  Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1033
  Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 589
  Parliament—Public Petition from a Foreign Town—Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1485

[*cont.*

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R.—*cont.*
Post Office—Miscellaneous Questions
Blue Books, Postage of, [228] 1324
Cape of Good Hope Mail Contract, [230] 1173
Channel Islands—Alderney, [228] 1323
Cheques, [227] 258
Cornwall, Telegraphic Communication in, [231] 113
Female Clerks in the Savings Bank Department, [228] 1179
Glasgow Post Office, [228] 1832
Hebrides, Mails to the, [227] 1868
House of Commons, [230] 1395
India, Postage to, [228] 351
Ireland, Mail Routes in, [227] 227
Letter Carriers' Uniform, [230] 246
North American Mail Contracts, [227] 258
North American Mails, [228] 63, 269 ; [230] 1393
Postal Rates, Reduction of, [227] 303
Postal Telegraph Service—Royal Engineers, [227] 1711
Postal Telegraph Wires, [228] 1579
Provincial Continental Messages, [230] 736
Rural Post Office Messengers (Ireland), [228] 1180
Telegraph Cards, [227] 137 ;— Messages, 1413 ; [231] 1068 ;—Stamps, [227] 404 ; —System, [229] 1053
Telegraphs — Glengarriffe, [228] 1180 ;— Safety of Wires (Metropolis), [228] 69 ; —Special Wires, [231] 815, 816
Telegraphs in Small Towns, [228] 1834
West India Home Mails, [230] 1819
Post Office — Postal Telegraph Department, Res. [228] 214
Telegraphs (Money), 2R. [227] 1490

Marine Mutiny Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Algernon Egerton*)
c. Ordered * *Mar* 14
Read 1° * *Mar* 20
Read 2° * *Mar* 24
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 30
Considered * *Mar* 31
Read 3° * *April* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *April* 3
Read 2ª * ; Committee negatived ; read 3ª *April* 4
Royal Assent *April* 7 [39 *Vict.* c. 9]

Maritime Contracts Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Considered in Committee ; Resolution agreed to, and reported ; Bill ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 10, [227] 142 [Bill 50]
Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 4, [229] 42
Bill withdrawn * *July* 6

Market Juries (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Patrick Martin*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 30 [Bill 117]
Read 2° * *May* 16
Committee [Dropped]

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 21, [230] 1431

MARLING, Mr. S. S., *Stroud*
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [229] 1528

Marriage Law Amendment
Question, Observations, Lord Chelmsford ; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *Mar* 27, [228] 609

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister
Question, Sir Thomas Chambers ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 21, [228] 352

Marriages (Saint James, Buxton) Bill
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 17 [Bill 79]
Read 2° * *Feb* 24
Committee * ; Report *Feb* 28
Read 3° * *Mar* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 3 (No. 22)
Read 2ª * *Mar* 7
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 9
Read 3ª * *Mar* 13
Royal Assent *Mar* 17 [39 *Vict.* c. i]

MARTEN, Mr. A. G., *Cambridge*
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [229] 1699 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [230] 1159 ; *cl.* 13, [231] 772 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 880
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [229] 1524
Crossed Cheques, 3R. [231] 1218
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1841
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [230] 1376
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 310
Judicature Acts—Issues of Fact in Chancery, [230] 1816
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 55
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Boroughs), 2R. [229] 1783
Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 20
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), (No. 2.), Comm. [231] 344
University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1095

MARTIN, Mr. P. W., *Rochester*
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1318
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1397
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1279
India—Oude, Ex-King of—Debts, [230] 620
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 27, [228] 1918

MASSEY, Right Hon. W. N., *Tiverton*
Inland Revenue Department, [231] 695

Master and Servant Laws — Employers Liability for Injuries to their Servants
Select Committee appointed "to inquire whether it may be expedient to render masters liable for injuries occasioned to their servants by the negligent acts of certificated managers of collieries, managers, foremen, and others to whom the general control and superintendence of workshops and works is committed, and whether the term 'common employ-

[*cont.*

Master and Servant Laws—Employers Liability for Injuries to their Servants—cont.
ment' could be defined by legislative enactment more clearly than it is by the law as it at present stands" (*Mr. Secretary Cross*) *June* 22
Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Lowe (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Cawley, Mr. Gibson, Sir Daniel Gooch, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Eustace Smith, Mr. Spencer Stanhope, Mr. Tennant, and Mr. Wyndham
Report of Select Comm. *July* 21—*P.P.* 372

MAXWELL, Sir W. STIRLING-, *Perthshire*
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1614
Italy—Hinde, Mr., Murder of, near Naples, [227] 864
William Mercer, Case of, [230] 1172
Scotland—King's Park at Stirling, [231] 565

Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities) Bill
(*Mr. Cowper-Temple, Mr. Russell Gurney, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Forsyth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 36]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 5, [230] 996
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Wheelhouse*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Medical Act (Qualifications) Bill
(*Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. John Bright*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 25 [Bill 170]
Read 2° * *June* 26
Committee * *July* 3, debate adjourned
Committee *—R.P. *July* 4
Committee *—R.P. *July* 10
Committee *; Report *July* 13
Considered * *July* 14
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *July* 20
Read 2ª *July* 25, [230] 1881 (No. 184)
Committee *; Report *July* 27
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 41]

Medical Degrees — "Conjoint Examinations"
Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 9, [227] 1709

Medical Practitioners Bill
(*Mr. Gibson, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Mulholland, Dr. Ward*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 18 [Bill 81]
Read 2° * *June* 26
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Considered * *June* 30
Read 3° * *July* 5
l. Read 1ª * (*Viscount Hutchinson*) *July* 6
Read 2ª * *July* 13 (No. 157)
Committee * *July* 17
Report * *July* 20
Read 3ª * *July* 21
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 40]

MELDON, Mr. C. H., *Kildare*
Animals, Cruelty to, [227] 1295
Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 1037, 1471
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Leave, [227] 545
Clerk of the Peace and of the Crown (Ireland), 2R., Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1338
County Rates (Ireland), 2R. [229] 306
Crab and Lobster Fisheries (Norfolk), [230] 429
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Res. [229] 1281
Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 477, 492, 529
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1181
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 554
Judicature Act, 1875—Eleventh Section, [229] 1422
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Kingstown Harbour, [229] 1116
Law Appointments—James Devine, Case of, [229] 1349
National Board of Education—Inspectors' Reports, [230] 615
National School Teachers, [227] 404; [229] 1349;—Contributory Unions, [227] 1294
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [228] 703
Ireland—Constabulary Pensioners, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 570, 572
Ireland—Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 311
Ireland—National School Teachers Act, 1875, Res. [228] 246
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker), Res. [229] 1437, 1439, 1440
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 1561
Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 260
Public Health (Ireland)—Vaccine Lymph, [227] 1021
Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 514
Local Government Board, &c. Amendt. [227] 515, 518
Public Education (Ireltnd), [231] 275, 279, 280
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 348, 363, 365

MELLOR, Mr. T. W., *Ashton-under-Lyne*
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 8, [230] 1529; *add. cl.* [231] 64; Consid. *cl.* 14, 532
Law Courts, New — Architect's Commission, [230] 948
Metropolis—Hyde Park—Rotten Row, [231] 516
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 20, Amendt. [229] 1765
Supply—New Courts of Justice and Offices, [229] 1591
Royal Parks and Gardens, [229] 1584
War Department Post Office (Remuneration, &c.), Comm. Amendt. [231] 857
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1143

Mercantile Marine Hospital Service Bill
(*Captain Pim, Mr. Wheelhouse*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 16 [Bill 76]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 26

Mercantile Marine

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

Burglaries at Sea, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 28, [228] 1835

Case of Horatio Walters, a Convict, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 14, [231] 1206

Greece—Loss of the "Agrigento," Question, Mr. T. E. Smith; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 13, [229] 1762

Holyhead Harbour—Wreck of the Steamship "Edith," Question, Mr. Serjeant Sherlock; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 15, [229] 670

"Locksley Hall," The—Decision at Thames Police Court, Question, Mr. Bates; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 28, [228] 1837; Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 4, [229] 41; Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 11, 368

Lighthouses, Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 23, [228] 469

"Lily of Devon," The, Question, Mr. Bates; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 18, [229] 925

Merchant Seamen Deserters—Existing Treaties, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 1, [228] 1909

Pensions to Seamen, Observations, Mr. T. Brassey; Reply, Sir Charles Adderley; debate thereon *Mar* 10, [227] 1812

Shipwrecked Vessels, Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 25, [229] 1190

The "Strathmore," Question, Admiral Egerton; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 22, [230] 243

Training Ship Schools, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 24, [227] 816

Training Ships, Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; debate thereon *Mar* 10, [227] 1780

Revised Regulations . *P.P.* c. 15, 222
Return 375

Uniformity of Nautical Terms, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 21, [227] 557

Unseaworthy Ships—Returns, Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 17, [227] 407; Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 22, 680

Wreck of the "Royal Adelaide," Question, Captain Digby; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 13, [227] 1868

Wrecks off Dungeness, Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 29, [229] 1356

Mercantile Marine — Pension Fund for Seamen

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to establish a compulsory, self-supporting Pension Fund for Seamen" (*Mr. T. Brassey*) *Mar* 10, [227] 1812; debate thereon

Mercantile Marine — The "Franconia" and "Strathclyde" Collision

Moved, "That there be laid before the House, Report of Mr. Rothery, Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty, on the conduct of the officers of the "Palmerston" after the collision of the "Franconia" and the "Strathclyde" (*Earl Granville*) *August* 11, [231] 1059; Motion agreed to (*P.P.* 245)

Question, The Marquess of Hamilton; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 28, [227] 1024; Question, Sir William Bagge; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 23, [230] 336

Merchant Service Officers—Examinations

Moved, "That it is expedient that voluntary examinations should be held under the Board of Trade in modern languages and commercial law, and that further inducements should be given to merchant officers to study at the Naval University at Greenwich" (*Mr. T. Brassey*) *May* 16, [229] 794; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Merchant Shipping Acts

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

Board of Trade Surveys — The "Mount Royal," Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 7, [227] 1566

Foreign Laws respecting Stowage, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 10, [228] 1478

Grain Cargoes, Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 1, [229] 1519

Grain Laden Vessels, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 28, [227] 1024

Correspondence . . . . *P.P.* [1405]
P.P. 211

Light Dues, Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 16, [229] 1971; Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *August* 3, [231] 421

Lighthouse on Coningbeg Rock, Question, Mr. Richard Power; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 29, [229] 1352

Load Line Returns, The, Question, Mr. Wilson; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 9, [227] 1707 *P.P.* 57

Merchant Seamen Deserters, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 26, [230] 422

Merchant Shipping Act, 1871—*The Schooner "Leader,"* Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 3, [230] 855

Merchant Shipping Acts, 1875-1876 — *Surveyors*, Question, Mr. O'Leary; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 4, [230] 947

Vessels surveyed . . *P.P.* [1383, 1433, 1532]

Overloading — Detention of Ships, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 29, [227] 1123 *P.P.* 3, 374

Rule of the Road at Sea, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 17, [227] 403 *P.P.* 58

[cont.

Merchant Shipping Acts—cont.
Scurvy on Board the "Royal Sovereign," Questions, Dr. Ward; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 15, [227] 302; *Mar* 6, 1414; *Mar* 9, 1715 *P.P.* 117
"*Strathclyde," The,* Question, The Marquess of Hamilton; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 28, [227] 1024;—*The Tug "Palmerston,"* Question, Sir William Bagge; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 23, [230] 336
Surgeons, Questions, Captain Pim; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 5, [229] 105; *July* 27, [230] 1963
The "Skerryvore," Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 22, [230] 244
The Steamer "Marie," Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 20, [230] 1629
Unseaworthy Ships, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 23, [228] 472 Report on—*P.P.* [1406]
Unseaworthy Ships of Foreign Nations, Question, Mr. Wilson; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 6, [227] 1419

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill (*Mr. Plimsoll, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Samuda, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson*)
c. Acts read; considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 34]
2R. [Dropped]

Merchant Shipping Bill (*Mr. Raikes, Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Edward Stanhope*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° *
227] *Feb* 10, 163 [Bill 49]
. Read 2°, after long debate *Feb* 17, 428
228] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 23, 519
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the Merchant Shipping Acts should be so amended that the breach of a contract of service not involving danger to life or injury to the ship on the part of a seaman should be no longer punishable with imprisonment and forfeiture, and should no longer render such seaman liable to be arrested without warrant within the United Kingdom" (*Mr. Gorst*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "greater facilities and encouragement should be given to the engagement and training of apprentices by shipowners" (*Mr. William*
. *Holms*) *v.*, 539; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.
. Committee—R.P. *Mar* 27, 627
. Committee—R.P. *Mar* 30, 884
. Committee—R.P. *April* 3, 1147
. Committee—R.P. *April* 6, 1367
. Committee—R.P. *April* 24, 1580
. Committee—R.P. *April* 27, 1779
. Committee—R.P. *April* 28, 1879
. Committee—R.P. *May* 1, 1913

[*cont.*

Merchant Shipping Bill—cont.
229] Committee—R.P. *May* 4, 53
. Committee; Report *May* 8, 208
. Considered *May* 22, 1054 [Bill 144]
Questions, Sir Charles Adderley, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answers, Sir George Jenkinson,
. Mr. Mac Iver *May* 26, 1274
. Read 3°, after short debate *May* 26, 1334
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 29
230] Read 2ª, after debate *June* 23, 317 (No. 99)
. Committee *July* 7, 1130
. Report *July* 14, 1432 (No. 160)
Read 3ª * *July* 21 (No. 177)
c. Lords' Amendments, Question, Mr. Norwood;
231] Answer, Mr. Disraeli *August* 7, 695
Moved, "That the Amendts. made by the Lords be now taken into Consideration"
. *August* 12, 1162
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day month" (*Mr. Mac Iver*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Lords Amendts. considered; some agreed to; some disagreed to
Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendts. to which this House hath disagreed;" List of the Committee, 1184
l. Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts., and Commons Reason for disagreeing to certain of the Amendts. made by the Lords con-
. sidered *August* 14, 1190
After short debate, Message sent to the House of Commons, To acquaint them, That the Lords do not insist upon their Amendts. to which the Commons disagree, and agree to the Amendts. made by the Commons to the Amendts. made by the Lords to the said Bill, with a consequential Amendt., to which they desire the concurrence of the Commons (No. 241)
c. Lords Consequential Amendt. read by the
. Clerk at the Table *August* 14, 1222; after short debate, Amendt. agreed to [Bill 271]
l. Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 80]

Merchant Shipping [*Salaries, &c.*]
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 2, [227] 1282; Question put; A. 71, N. 34; M. 37
Matter considered in Committee; a Resolution agreed to

METROPOLIS
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Art Library, The, South Kensington, Questions, Mr. Torrens, Mr. John Bright; Answers, Viscount Sandon *May* 5, [229] 104
Artizans Dwellings Act—Lancashire Court, Bond Street, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 14, [231] 1204 Return—*Parl. P.* 294
British Museum, The—Salaries, Question, Mr. W. M. Torrens; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 24, [228] 1576; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 3, [230] 858; —*The Reading Rooms,* Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 10, [228] 1476
Returns (Science and Art) *P.P.* 416

[*cont.*

METROPOLIS—*cont.*

Courts of Justice, New, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 4, [229] 34

Indian and Colonial Museum, South Kensington, Questions, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *June* 22, [230] 256; *June* 29, 617; *July* 13, 1398; *August* 10, [231] 974 Return—(*Parl. P.* 448)

Metropolis Improvements — Northumberland Avenue, Question, Viscount Templetown; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *April* 7, [228] 1394; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir James Hogg *May* 8, [229] 205

Metropolitan Improvements Models, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 21, [228] 350

Metropolitan Police—Helmets, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 24, [230] 1819

Museum of Patents and Inventions, South Kensington, Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 30, [229] 1421

National Gallery

Question, Sir John Leslie; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *July* 3, [230] 856

The New Buildings, Question, Mr. Coope; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 17, [228] 170; Questions, Mr. Cowper-Temple, Mr. Monk; Answers, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 30, [229] 1422

The Turner Pictures, Question, Lord Francis Hervey; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *June* 29, [230] 618

The Wynn Ellis Bequest, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 21, [227] 560

New Public Offices—Site, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 29, [229] 1350;—*Approaches,* Question, Mr. James; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *Feb* 17, [227] 402

Paving, Cleansing, and Lighting, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Sir James Hogg *June* 26, [230] 423;—*Repaving the Streets,* Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Sir James Hogg *Feb* 24, [227] 815

Price of Gas, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *August* 10, [231] 969

Removal of Snow, Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 17, [227] 399

Royal Mint — The New Site, Question, Mr. Hankey; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 3, [231] 420

Street Traffic

Accidents from Vans, &c., Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 10, [228] 1482

Hyde Park Corner, Question, Observations, Viscount Enfield; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short debate thereon *Feb* 21, [227] 548; Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *Feb* 24, 814; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 21, [228] 352; Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 26, [229] 1273; Question, Mr. Cawley; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *July* 3, [230] 857; Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 14, [231] 1199

[See title *Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner*]

Piccadilly and Grosvenor Place, Question, Sir Charles Legard; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *Feb* 17, [227] 406

Temple Bar, Question, Mr. Edwards; Answer Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 2, [227] 1203

Thames—The Prevention of Floods—Legislation, Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Sir James Hogg *Mar* 7, [227] 1568

The Parks

Hyde Park—State of Rotten Row, Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *Mar* 2, [227] 1206; Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 15, [229] 672; Questions, Mr. Repton; Mr. Mellor; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 4, [231] 516

The Serpentine, Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, 228] Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 23, 479; Question, Mr. Adam; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 31, 969; Question, The Marquess of Lansdowne; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *April* 7, 1393; Question, Mr. Sotheron-Estcourt; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *July* 3, [230] 855

[See title *Metropolis — Hyde Park — The Serpentine*]

St. James's Park, Question, Lord Francis Hervey; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *June* 12, [229] 1664;—*The Ornamental Water,* Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 29, [229] 1350

Victoria Park, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 18, [229] 927

The University Boat Race — Hammersmith Bridge, Question, Sir Henry Holland; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 30, [228] 883

[See title *Toll Bridges* (*River Thames*)]

Victoria Embankment, The, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Sir James Hogg *Mar* 13, [227] 1867

Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner

Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 26, [229] 1273

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "the annually increasing congestion of traffic in the approaches to Hyde Park Corner has become the source of hindrance, annoyance, and danger to the public, and merits the early attention of this House" (*Mr. Christopher Beckett Denison*) v., 1576; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

[See *Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions*]

[*cont.*

Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine
Question, Mr. Pease ; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *Mar* 9, [227] 1714
Moved, "That the mounds at present being erected on the south of the Serpentine are unsightly, and will, when planted, be detrimental to the picturesque character of Hyde Park, and ought to be removed" (*Mr. Pease*) *April* 4, [228] 1247 ; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *April* 27, 1815 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Metropolis—Municipal Government
Moved, "That the reform of the government of the Metropolis, with a view to its more efficient, uniform, and economical administration, is a question of primary importance, and deserves the early attention of Her Majesty's Government" (*Lord Elcho*) *June* 13, [229] 1784 ; after debate, Motion withdrawn
[See title *City of London Companies, Address for a Return* (*Mr. James*)]

Metropolis (*Parochial System*)
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the parochial system is unsuitable and inadequate to the reasonable requirements of the inhabitants of the Metropolis ; and that the subject deserves the attention of Her Majesty's Government, with a view to remove by legislation the great evils which at present exist" (*Sir William Fraser*) *Feb* 15, [227] 308 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Metropolis Gas Act, 1860
Gas Companies' Accounts, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke ; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 8, [229] 204
Accounts for 1875 . . . . *P.P.* 291
Gas Referees, Question, Colonel Makins ; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 23, [229] 1110

Metropolis Gas Companies Bill
(*Sir James Hogg, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Goldney*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 28]
2R. *Mar* 24, [228] 597 [House counted out]
Read 2°, and referred to a Select Committee *May* 9, [229] 305

Metropolis Gas (Surrey Side) Bill
(*Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Edward Stanhope*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 21 [Bill 204]
Read 2° *, and committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two to be nominated by the Committee of Selection *July* 12
Ordered, That all Petitions presented against the Bill be referred to the Select Committee on the Bill, provided such Petitions are presented one clear day before the meeting of the Committee ; and that such of the Petitioners as pray to be heard, by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents, be heard upon their Petitions, if they think fit, and Counse heard in favour of the Bill against the said Petitions :—That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records :—That three be the quorum (*Sir Charles Adderley*)
And, on *July* 17, Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Forster (Chairman), Mr. Tremayne, nominated by the Committee of Selection ; Mr. Garnier, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Richard Bright ; *July* 27, Mr. Goldney *disch.*, Mr. Onslow *added ; July* 19, Mr. Richard Bright *added*, Mr. Tremayne *disch.*
Report of Select Comm. *July* 28 [No. 384]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 28

Metropolis (Whitechapel and Limehouse) Improvement Scheme Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Steward*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 15 (No. 120)
Read 2ª * *June* 22
Committee ; Report, after short debate *July* 4, [230] 940
Read 3ª, after short debate *July* 6, 1040
c. Read 1° * *July* 7 [Bill 241]
Read 2° * *July* 10
Committee * ; Report *July* 18
Considered * *July* 20
Read 3° * *July* 21
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cc]

Metropolitan Board of Works
Finance—Report and Accounts, 1875— (*P.P.* 290)
Question, Mr. Hayter ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 14, [231] 1204
Metropolis Improvements — Northumberland Avenue, Question, Viscount Templetown ; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *April* 7, [228] 1394 ; Question, Mr. Anderson ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *May* 8, [229] 205
Metropolitan Street Improvements Act, 1872—*Clause* 49, Question, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *May* 11, [229] 364
Paving, Cleansing, and Lighting, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *June* 26, [230] 423 ;—*Repaving the Streets*, Question, Lord Ernest Bruce ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *Feb* 24, [227] 815
Returns, Question, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *July* 3, [230] 852
The Thames Embankment, Question, Mr. W. Gordon ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *July* 6, [230] 1042 ;—*High Tides*, Question, Mr. Locke ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *July* 13, 1393
Thames—The Prevention of Floods—Legislation, Question, Mr. Locke ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *Mar* 7, [227] 1568
Victoria Embankment, The, Question, Colonel Beresford ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *Mar* 13, [227] 1867

Metropolitan Board of Works Bill (by Order)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir James Hogg*) *Feb* 24, [227] 806
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir Sydney Waterlow*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Metropolitan Board of Works (Loans) Bill (*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Ordered * *July* 13
Read 1° * *July* 14 [Bill 251]
Read 2° * *July* 20
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3°* *July* 24
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *July* 25 (No. 190)
Read 2ª * *August* 8
Committee *; Report *August* 9
Read 3ª * *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 55]

Metropolitan Commons (Barnes) Bill (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 1 [Bill 181]
Read 2° * *June* 12
Bill withdrawn * *June* 15

Metropolitan Commons (Barnes) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Steward*)

l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 15 (No. 119)
Read 2ª * *June* 22
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3ª * *July* 3
c. Read 1° * (*Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson*) *July* 6
Read 2° * *July* 10 [Bill 234]
Committee *; Report *July* 18
Read 3° * *July* 20
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clvi]

Metropolitan Fire Brigade

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the constitution, efficiency, emoluments, and finances of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade" (*Mr. Ritchie*) *Mar* 21, [228] 353
After short debate, Amendt. to add, at end "and into the most efficient means of providing further security from loss of life and property by fire in the metropolis" (*Mr. Assheton Cross*), 307; Question, "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Ordered, That a Select Committee, &c.
And, on *Mar* 31, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson (Chairman), Mr. Clifton, Mr. Forsyth, Sir William Fraser, Mr. Hankey, Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. John Stewart Hardy, Mr. Hayter, Mr. Herbert, Sir James Hogg, Mr. Kinnaird, Lord Lindsay, Mr. Locke, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Onslow, Sir Henry Peek, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Stevenson, Marquess of Tavistock, Mr. Young; *April* 27, Mr. Fielden, *disch.*
Report of Select Comm. *July* 20 *P.P.* 371

Metropolitan Fire Brigade—Fire at Chelsea

Question, Mr. Bass; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 20, [230] 1625

Metropolitan Railway Bill (by Order)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Edward Watkin*) *Feb* 24, [227] 807
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Lord Claud Hamilton*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 125, N. 194; M. 69
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months
Notice of Question, Sir Edward Watkin *Feb* 29, 1119

Midland Railway—The Radstock Accident—The Block System

Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *August* 11, [231] 1078

MIDLETON, Viscount

Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 636
Commons, 2R. [230] 1037
Irish Peerage, Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1898
Judicature Act, 1873—Home Circuit, Abolition of, [227] 475, 478
Mercantile Marine—Training Ships, [227] 1792
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 1074
University of Oxford, Comm. [228] 928

MILLS, Mr. A., *Exeter*

Education Code—Subjects, Choice of, Res. [227] 1808
Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 958; 2R. 1950; Comm. *cl.* 5, [230] 1300; *cl.* 6, 1408; *cl.* 14, 1453; *add. cl.* 1538, 1651, 1665, 1707, 1834; [231] 23; Consid. *cl.* 8, 475; *cl.* 14, 533, 554
Local Government Act—Harrogate Board of Health, [229] 1896
Parliament, Acts of—Report of Select Committee, Res. [228] 571
Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 494
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1837
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 308; 3R. 484
Slave Trade—Sultan of Zanzibar, [228] 72
Slave Trade Legislation—Royal Commission, [227] 398
West African Settlements—Gambia, Cession of the, [227] 683

Mines

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

Accidents in Coal Mines, Question, Mr. Sidebottom; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 22, [227] 674
Mines Act—Use of Blasting Powder—Legislation, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 10, [227] 136; *Feb* 28, 1022; *Mar* 10, 1797
Further Report . . . . [1449]
Mines Inspectors Reports for 1875, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 22, [227] 680 *P.P.* [1499]

[*cont.*

Mines—cont.
The Birley Explosion, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 11, [230] 1279
The Clifton Hall Colliery Accident, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 11, [231] 1074
The Wigan Collieries, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 13, [229] 1760

MINTO, Earl of
Church of Scotland (Election of Ministers), Motion for Returns, [228] 1384
Criminal Law—Police Constable Maconachie, Case of, [228] 599.
Scottish Teinds—Returns, [227] 1118
United Parishes (Scotland), [228] 57, 58

Monastic and Conventual Institutions Bill
(*Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Holt, Sir Thomas Chambers*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 24]
Bill withdrawn* *Mar* 29

Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain)
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 31, To leave out from "That," and add "it is expedient that an inquiry be undertaken as to the number, rate of increase, character, and present position, in relation to the Law, of Monastic and Conventual Institutions in Great Britain" (*Sir Thomas Chambers*) *v.*, [228] 970; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 127, N. 87; M. 40
Further Papers . . . . [1395, 1420]

MONCREIFF, Lord
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [227] 922

MONK, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester City*
Admiralty—Civilian First Lords, Res. [227] 1877
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [231] 981
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Acts, 1871 and 1872, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 373
Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, Motion for Adjournment, [231] 494
Endowed Schools Commissioners—Nuneaton Grammar School, [228] 701
Endowed Schools—Perse Grammar School, [229] 1763
Exchequer Bonds, 3R. [227] 1434
Gloucester District Registry, [229] 925
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 351
Inland Revenue—Out-door Excise Establishments, [230] 422
Metropolis—St. James's Park, Ornamental Water in, [229] 1350
National Gallery—New Buildings, [229] 1423
Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5, Comm. [231] 72
Offences against the Person, Comm. [228] 1623
[*cont.*

MONK, Mr. C. J.—*cont.*
Ordnance Survey—Civil Assistants, [227] 811
Parliament—Public Business, [228] 1837
Pollution of Rivers, 3R. [231] 561
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 329
Suez Canal—Sir Daniel Lange, [227] 1207
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 854
Supply—Charity Commission, [227] 504
  Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 338
  Civil Service Commission, [227] 508
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1467, 1468
  Lord Privy Seal, Amendt. [227] 502
  Report, [227] 997
  Sheriff Court Houses (Scotland), [228] 252
War in the East, [231] 970
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1140
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1362

MONTAGU, Right Hon. Lord R., *Westmeath*
Army and Navy Expenditure Accounts, Audit of, [229] 2010
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 737
Consolidated Fund, 3R. [228] 564
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2064
Customs Acts, Consolidation of, [228] 1578
Egypt—Ministry of Finance—The Decree, [229] 775, 776
  Suez Canal—English Representatives, [227] 561
  Suez Canal Company—Statutes and Bye-Laws, [227] 229, 265
Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 959; 2R. 1941; Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1289, 1292; Amendt. 1296, 1297; *cl.* 5, 1299; *cl.* 6, 1405, 1409; *cl.* 14, 1453; *cl.* 20, 1499; *cl.* 26, 1505; *add. cl.* 1663, 1706, 1909; [231] 16, 64; Consid. 467; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 476, 483, 524, 548
Elementary Education Bill—Poor Educational Districts, [229] 1191, 1192
Parliament — Public Petition from a Foreign Town — Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1418, 1485
Parliament — Public Petitions — Grants of Money, [230] 248
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, Res. [228] 1241, 1242
Pollution of Rivers, Leave, [229] 1600
Post Office—Rural Post Office Messengers (Ireland), [228] 1180
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 288
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 508
  Local Government Board, &c. [227] 518
  Suez Canal Shares, [227] 294

MONTGOMERY, Sir G. G., *Peeblesshire*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 27
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1638, 1639
Poor Law (Scotland), Comm. [230] 522
Prince Edward Island—Land Purchase Act, 1875, [227] 559
Supply—Public Education in Scotland, [231] 268

Moore, Mr. A. J., *Clonmel*
Army—The Guards—Special Allowances, [228] 968 ; [229] 1989 ;—Stock Purse Fund Allowances, [228] 1626, 1762
Cattle Diseases (Ireland)—Pleuro-Pneumonia—Compulsory Slaughter, [230] 253
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 781
Grand Jury System (Ireland)—Legislation, [227] 483
Intemperance, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 721
Irish Church—Sale of Ecclesiastical Edifices, [230] 1973
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 713
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1001
Navy—Creed Register, [229] 928
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [230] 469
Poor Law (Ireland)—Kilmacthomas Workhouse, [228] 1404

Moore, Mr. S., *Tipperary*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 360

Morgan, Mr. G. Osborne, *Denbighshire*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [230] 1149 ; *cl.* 3, 1159 ; *cl.* 6, 1161, 1162
Barristers and Advocates Fees, 2R. [229] 338
Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, Amendt. [230] 1915, 1922, 1923, 1925
Burial Services—Dore Burial Case, [228] 469, 470, 966
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1296, 1332
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, [230] 1875 ; Consid. *cl.* 14, Motion for Adjournment, [231] 493
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 737
Judicature Acts—Issues of Fact in Chancery, [230] 1816
Offences against the Person, Comm. [228] 1623
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 587
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 594
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [228] 294, 1984
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 440
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1325
University of Oxford, 2R. Amendt. [229] 1721

Morley, Earl of
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [230] 1429, 1430
Firman on Reforms—Sublime Porte—Andrassy Note, Address for Papers, [227] 1407
227] University of Oxford, 1R. 803 ; 2R. 1687
228] Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 932 ; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 938 ; *cl.* 14, 943 ; *cl.* 16, 960 ; Amendt. 1306, 1307 ; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1311 ; Report, *cl.* 16, 1951 ; *add. cl. ib.*

Morley, Mr. S., *Bristol*
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1232 ; *cl.* 11, 1419 ; *add. cl.* 1902
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1269
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1834

Morris, Mr. G., *Galway*
India—Army Furlough Rules, [229] 919
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 673
Poor Law Rating (Ireland), Res. [229] 842
Poor Law Rating (Ireland), 2R. [229] 2024

Mowbray, Right Hon. J. R., *Oxford University*
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 355
Parliament—Private Bill Committees—Referees, Instruction, Res. [228] 613
University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1118, 1119, 1121

Mulholland, Mr. J., *Downpatrick*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 727
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 777
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 797
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1176
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 63
Tenant Right at the Expiration of Leases (Ireland), 2R. [228] 2040

Mundella, Mr. A. J., *Sheffield*
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [230] 1594
Education—Factories Act, 1874—Examinations, [227] 261
Education—Legislation, [227] 1714
Education Department — Keynsham British School, [229] 1894, 1895, 1974 ; [230] 246
Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1662
229] Elementary Education, Leave, 954 ; 2R. Amendt. 1897
230] 41, 100 ; Comm. 1244, 1247 ; *cl.* 4, 1289 ; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1399, 1404 ; Amendt. 1408, 1409 ; *cl.* 11, 1419, 1445 ; *cl.* 16, 1497 ; *cl.* 20, 1501 ; *cl.* 26, 1504 ; *cl.* 33, 1511 ; *cl.* 34, 1512 ; *add. cl.* 1664, 1665, 1666, 1667 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 1726, 1837, 1900, 1901, 1904, 1905
231] 21, 26 ; Consid. *cl.* 14, 489 ; Motion for Adjournment, 492, 549
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1273, 1299
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 544
Merchant Shipping, Comm. [228] 535 ; *cl.* 15, 1604, 1621 ; *cl.* 16, 1803 ; *add. cl.* 1948 ; [229] 210, 226
Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1604
Parliament—Public Petitions—Monastic and Conventual Institutions, [228] 1398
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [231] 710

[*cont.*

Mundella, Mr. A. J.—*cont.*
Patent Laws—Legislation, [227] 484
Royal Titles Proclamation, [228] 1775
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 508; Amendt. 513; Amendt. 1099
Report, [227] 997
Trade Union Act (1871), [227] 678
Turkey—Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [230] 1184; [231] 728, 737
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1138
Wild Fowl Preservation, Comm. [229] 1662

Municipal Corporations (England and Wales), Unreformed
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it would be desirable to forthwith abolish all criminal jurisdiction exercised by unreformed Municipal Corporations or their officers, with the exception of that of the City of London, for which due provision has been made by statute" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *Feb* 29, [227] 1126; after debate, Motion withdrawn
A Royal Commission, Question, Mr. Tremayne; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 23, [228] 479
Lostwithiel, Explanation, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 15, [228] 1
The Commission, Observations, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 5, [229] 182
Yarmouth and Brading, Isle of Wight, Observations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; short debate thereon *June* 9, [229] 1619

Municipal Corporations, &c. (Funds) Bill
(*Sir Sydney Waterlow, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Morley, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Dixon*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 10 [Bill 101]
2R. [Dropped]

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill
(*Major O'Gorman, Mr. Butt, Mr. Richard Power, Sir Colman O'Loghlen*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 7]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 1, [227] 1164
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 148, N. 176; M. 28
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Municipal Officers Superannuation Bill
(*Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Birley, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Cawley, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, Mr. Torr*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 2]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 15, [227] 322
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Fielden*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 101, N. 94; M. 7
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

[*cont.*

Municipal Officers Superannuation Bill—cont.
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 7, 1603
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Fielden*) *v.*; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 68, N. 88, M. 20
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Committee put off for six months

Municipal Privileges (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Butt, Mr. Ronayne*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 39]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 17, [227] 468
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir Arthur Guinness*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *May* 9
Considered *August* 5, [231] 661; Amendts. made; Amendt. in page 3, line 42, after "privilege," to insert "or to be elected to any corporate office" (*Mr. Gibson*); further proceeding adjourned
Debate resumed *August* 7, 774; after short debate, Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to; another Amendt. made; Bill read 3°
Lords Amendts [Bill 296]
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Waveney*) *August* 8 (No. 211)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *August* 10, 932
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and add ("this day month") (*The Earl of Limerick*); after short debate, on Question, that ("now,") &c.; Cont. 41, Not-Cont. 14; M. 27; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2ª
Committee*; Report *August* 11
Read 3ª* *August* 12
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 76]

Muntz, Mr. P. H., *Birmingham*
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, Res. [227] 1766
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 974
Army Estimates—Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers and Half Pay, [229] 1658
Land Forces, [227] 1463
Military Education, Establishments for, [229] 1657
Pay and Allowances, [227] 1487
Warlike and other Stores, [229] 1638, 1647
Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1653
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 684, 735; Comm. 971
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1283, 1286; *cl.* 11, 1446, 1447; *cl.* 14, 1456; *cl.* 16, 1497; *cl.* 26, 1505; *add. cl.* 1542, 1666, 1902, 2007
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1637
Malta, Taxation in, Res. [229] 1988
Mercantile Marine—"Locksley Hall," The, [229] 41, 42, 368

[*cont.*

Muntz, Mr. P. H.—*cont.*
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 27, [228] 1916, 1917
Metropolis — Hyde Park Corner, Traffic at, [229] 1274
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1858
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1769; *add. cl.* 1779
Post Office—West India Home Mails, [230] 1819
Prisons, 2R. [230] 903
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 316, 323
Santa Fé—Bullion, Seizure of, [230] 1046
South Kensington Museum—Art Library, [227] 1567
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 847
Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—Household of, &c. [227] 1842
  Mint, including Coinage, [227] 523
  Public Works in Ireland, [227] 1844; Amendt. 1846
Valuation of Property, Leave, [227] 248
Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1940
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1352

Mure, Colonel W., *Renfrew*
Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1753
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1479
Army Recruiting, [229] 1663; Res. [227] 1215
Barbadoes — Social and Political Condition, [231] 57
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1384, 1385
Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1878; [231] 284
Turkey—Eastern Question—The Papers, [229] 1423
  Guaranteed Loan, 1855, [231] 423

Murphy, Mr. N. D., *Cork City*
Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland), 2R. [228] 1886
Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [230] 1678
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 23, Amendt. [228] 1884; *add. cl.* [229] 220
Prisons (Ireland), [230] 1964
Public Houses (Ireland) — Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 510
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1351; [231] 59
Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [227] 1841

Mutiny Bill (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Secretary Hardy, The Judge Advocate*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 9
Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 13, [227] 1873
Read 2°* *Mar* 24
Committee—R.P. *Mar* 27, [228] 688
Committee; Report *Mar* 30, 912
Considered *Mar* 31, 1035
Read 3°* *April* 9
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl Cadogan*) *April* 3
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *April* 4
Royal Assent *April* 7 [39 *Vict.* c. 6]

Naghten, Mr. A. R., *Winchester*
Army—Militia Adjutants, [227] 1768; [229] 262; [230] 1621
  Militia, Staff-Sergeants of, [227] 812
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1273
Civil Service—Writers, Lower Division of, [228] 472
Criminal Law—Quarter Sessions—Juries' Summons, [228] 1576
Mercantile Marine—Blackwood's "Night Helm Indicator," [227] 1208
Navy—Reserve Forces—Captains in the Royal Marine Artillery, [228] 67
Parliament — Privilege — Lords Lieutenant, [230] 854

Napier and Ettrick, Lord
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 6, [227] 1288
Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 834; Comm. 1067
Turkey—Berlin Memorandum, [230] 404

Napier of Magdala, Lord
Indian Government, Address for Papers, [231] 512

Navy
Miscellaneous Questions
Anchors, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 10, [228] 1479
  "Britannia" Cadets . . . . *P.P.* 196
Chain Cables—H.M.S. "Serapis," Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 9, [227] 1708
Chain Cables and Anchors, Question, Observations, The Duke of Somerset; Reply, The Earl of Malmesbury; short debate thereon *Feb* 21, [227] 545;—*The "Victoria and Albert"* — *The "Serapis,"* Questions, Captain Pim; Answers, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 24, [228] 562; *Mar* 31, 964
Arctic Expedition, The, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 17, [227] 401; —*Officers of the "Pandora,"* Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 23, [229] 1110; — *The Admiralty Instructions*, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 26, [230] 422
  Further Papers . . . . . . [1560]
Army and Navy Surgeons—Foreign Diplomas, Question, Dr. Brady; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 16, [229] 777
Arrest of Seamen—Leave-Breaking, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 1, [228] 1907
Audit of Army and Navy Expenditure Accounts, Observations, Mr. J. Holms; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *June* 16, [229] 2001
British and Foreign Iron-Clad Navies, Observations, Mr. E. J. Reed; Reply, Mr. Hunt; debate thereon *Mar* 13, [227] 1891
Circular Ships, Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 10, [227] 1798
Coal, Question, Mr. Hussey Vivian; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 6, [227] 1413
  Return of Trial . . . . . . *P.P.* 280
Commanders—Order in Council, 1864, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 5, [229] 104

[*cont.*

NAVY—*cont.*

Condemned Provisions—The Return, Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 1, [229] 1519

Condemned Ships, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 20, [228] 268

Coroners in Naval Districts, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 31, [231] 115

Creed Register, Question, Mr. Arthur Moore; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 18, [229] 928
Religious Denominations . . *P.P.* 132

Designs of Ships of War, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 12, [231] 1157

Deterioration of Boilers, Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 10, [231] 968

Good Conduct Badges, Questions, Sir Frederick Perkins; Answer, Mr. A. Egerton *July* 6, [230] 1044

Greenwich Pensioners in Government Employ, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Sir Massey Lopes *Mar* 27, [228] 620

H.M.S. "Caledonia"—The "Lion" Training Ship, Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 9, [229] 1602

H.M.S. "Devastation," Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 2, [227] 1207
Report—*P.P.* 104

H.M.S. "Monarch" and "Raleigh"—Collision, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. A. Egerton *August* 14, [231] 1202

H.M.S. "Raleigh," Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 22, [230] 257

H.M.S. "Thunderer"—The Recent Explosion, Questions, Mr. D. Jenkins, Mr. J. R.
230] Yorke; Answers, Mr. Hunt *July* 18, 1525; Questions, Captain Pim, Mr. Anderson; Answers, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 25, 1887; Questions, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Goschen; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross, Mr. Hunt *July* 27, 1971; Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 28,
231] 8; Questions, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 11, 1072; *August* 14, 1205

Lowering Ships' Boats, Question, Mr. T. E. Smith; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 20, [228] 268

Naval Cadet College—Milford Haven, Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 30, [228] 878

Naval Cadets, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 24, [227] 816

Naval Discipline Act, 1866—*Flogging in the Navy*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 12, [229] 487

Naval Interpreters, Questions, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answers, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 31, [228] 968; *April* 6, 1327

Naval Officers and the Press, Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 4, [229] 36

Naval Officers Holding Civil Appointments, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 28, [228] 1829; Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 4, [229] 37
Return—*P.P.* 245

Naval Surgeons—Sir Gilbert Blane's Bequest, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. A. Egerton *July* 6, [230] 1043

[*cont.*

NAVY—*cont.*

Navigating Officers, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 22, [227] 682; Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy *June* 16, [229] 2012

Navy Chaplains, Vestments of, Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 10, [231] 976

Navy Estimates — Repairs, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 14, [229] 1820

Navy Meat, Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 22, [230] 244

Promotion to Flag Rank, Question, Observations, The Earl of Camperdown; Reply, Lord Elphinstone; short debate thereon *May* 26, [229] 1257

Retired Naval Commanders, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 8, [231] 818

Royal Marines

Increase of Pay, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 9, [227] 1717

Officers of Royal Marines, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 22, [227] 683;—*Retirement*, Question, Captain Price *June* 16, [229] 2012

Pay and Promotion, Observations, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; short debate thereon *April* 10, [228] 1518

Royal Marine Light Infantry, Questions, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answers, Mr. Hunt *July* 13, [230] 1391; *August* 11, [231] 1069

Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 16, [229] 774

Royal Naval College, Greenwich—Examinations, Question, Mr. Kavanagh; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 13, [227] 1864

Royal Naval Engineers, Committee on—The Report, Question, Major Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 16, [228] 68;—Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 25, [229] 1193;—*Engineer Officers and Engine-Room Artificers*, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 22, [229] 1040; Observations, Mr. Gorst; Reply, Mr. Hunt *June* 16, 2013;—*Engineer Service, The*, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 4, [229] 44

Screw Propellers, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 13, [227] 1865

Sub-Lieutenants, Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 25, [229] 1186

Tenders for Shipbuilding, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 10, [230] 1177

The Detached Squadron, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 17, [228] 171

The Dockyards

Admission of Foreign Officers, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 29, [229] 1348

New Dock at Devonport, Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 4, [229] 41

Superintendents of H.M. Dockyards, Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 10, [231] 967

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

The Mediterranean Squadron, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 24, [230] 1819

The Reserve Forces—Captains in the Royal Marine Artillery, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 16, [228] 67

The Royal Naval Reserve, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 27, [230] 1964; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 8, [231] 818 Returns—*P.P.* 315

The Troop-Ship "Orontes," Question, Mr. Palmer; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 25, [227] 928

Torpedoes—Captain Harvey, Question, Captain G. E. Price; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 24, [228] 563

Training Ships (Ireland), Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. A. Egerton *July* 6, [230] 1049

Widows of Seamen and Marines, Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 18, [227] 482

Navy—Administration of the Navy

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 26, To leave out from "That," and add "considering the present administration of the Admiralty is practically that introduced and adopted by this House in 1833, on the recommendation of Sir James Graham; and, considering the advance made in Naval armaments and the unsatisfactory condition of the personnel and matériel of Her Majesty's Navy, it is desirable that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire and report whether the present system under which the Navy is administered is the most efficient and economical, and what improvements or amendments, if any, it would be desirable should be introduced" (*Captain Pim*) *v.*, [230] 432; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to

Navy—Captain Sulivan

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, Captain Sulivan should not have been removed from the command of one of Her Majesty's ships for any alleged error, shortcoming, or neglect of duty, without having been given an opportunity, if he desired it, of explaining or defending his conduct before a competent court" (*Mr. Ashley*) *July* 11, [230] 1314; after debate, Question put; A. 91, N. 103; M. 12

Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 13, 1397

Correspondence . . . . *P.P.* 344, 350

Navy—Designs of Ships of War—Petition of Mr. Charles Henwood—See title *Parliament—Privilege*

Navy—Iron-clads—The Suez Canal

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Return of the draught of water of each first-class ironclad, noting in each case whether such ship could or could not pass through

[*cont.*

Navy—Iron-Clads—The Suez Canal—cont.

the Suez Canal when complete in coal, provisions, stores, and armament" (*The Lord Dunsany*) *Mar* 13, [227] 1855; after short debate, on Question? resolved in the negative

Navy—Loss of H.M.S. "Vanguard"

Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 10, [227] 132; Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 14, 263; Questions, Mr. David Jenkins; Answers, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 20, [228] 270; *May* 25, [229] 1194; Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 3, [230] 870; Questions, Captain Pim; Answers, Mr. Hunt *July* 17, 1478; *August* 11, [231] 1076; *August* 12, 1156

Orders of the Day postponed *Feb* 28

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Copy of a further Minute relating to the loss of H.M.S. 'Vanguard'" (*Mr. Goschen*), [227] 1026

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House the opportunity should be afforded to the Admiral in Command, Vice Admiral Sir Walter Tarleton, K.C.B. of clearing his reputation by being tried by a Court Martial" (*Captain Pim*) *v.*, 1074; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Seely*); Motion withdrawn

Question again proposed; Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to

Papers, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 13, [227] 1869

The Return, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 23, [230] 337

Papers and Plans . . *P.P.* 50, 98, 98-I
Fleetmen 63
The Court Martial . . [1384, 1384-I]

Navy—Navigation of Her Majesty's Ships

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it having been determined gradually to abolish the system of employing a separate and distinct branch of officer for navigating duties, it is desirable that greater encouragement and a more extended training than at present adopted should be given to the officers of the Fleet to obtain practical experience in surveying, pilotage, and navigation; and that in carrying out the intended change due regard should be paid to the position and prospects of existing class of navigating officers" (*Mr. Hanbury Tracy*) *April* 25, [228] 1635

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "considering the greatly increased value of Her Majesty's ships of late years, and the importance of providing for their safe navigation, this House is of opinion that the training and instruction, as well as the position of navigating officers, demands serious attention, but that the abolition of a separate and distinct class of officers to perform these duties is a step which can only be approached with extreme caution and under a sense of the gravest responsibility" (*Captain Price*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, House counted out

Navy — Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5
- Order for Committee read; Moved, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 18; Debate adjourned
- Debate resumed *July* 29, [231] 72; Question again proposed; after short debate, Debate adjourned
- Question again proposed; Debate resumed *August* 5, 656; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; matter considered in Committee; after short time spent therein, Resolutions agreed to; Resolutions reported *August* 7

Navy—Punishment of Flogging
- Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 12, [229] 487
- Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when the punishment of Flogging in the Navy should be abolished" (*Mr. P. A. Taylor*) *June* 20, [230] 147
- Amendt. to leave out from " House," and add "corporal punishment in the Navy having been abolished in 1871 for all offences which do not require prompt and immediate punishment, and being only now retained for the case of mutiny and for offences which may imperil the safety of the ship on the high seas, it is inexpedient to take further steps for the total abolition of the punishment" (*Mr. Hanbury Tracy*) *v.*; Question proposed, " That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
- Main Question put; A. 62, N. 120; M. 58
  - Crime and Punishment—Returns *P.P.* 201
  - Corporal Punishment 298

Navy—Ships of War
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 8, To leave out from " That," and add " this House, while approving the programme of work on iron-clad ships for the ensuing financial year, is of opinion that the present is a fitting opportunity for reviewing our ship-building policy, and the resources of the mercantile marine for naval purposes; and this House is further of opinion that such inquiry should be held by a Royal Commission" (*Mr. T. Brassey*) *v.*, [229] 235; Question proposed, " That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Navy — The Admiralty—Civilian First Lords
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 13, To leave out from " That," and add " in the opinion of this House, the practice of placing at the head of the Admiralty civilians, who from their antecedents cannot be conversant with the business of that Department, is detrimental to the interests of the service" (*Mr. Bentinck*) *v.*, [227] 1873; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 261, N. 18; M. 243
  - First Lords since 1660 . . . *P.P.* 235

Navy—The Collision of the " Alberta" and the " Mistletoe"
- *Baron Bramwell,* Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 14, [227] 258; Questions, Mr. T. E. Smith, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 2, 1203
- *Captain Welch,* Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 25, [229] 1194
- *Further Inquiry,* Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 26, [230] 428
- 228] *Report of Court of Inquiry,* Questions, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Anderson; Answers, Mr. Hunt *April* 7, 1409; Questions, Mr. Watkin Williams, Sir Robert Peel; Answers, Mr. Hunt *April* 10, 1476
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 10, To leave out from " That," and add " as the Officers appointed by the Admiralty to inquire into the circumstances attending the collision between the 'Alberta' and the 'Mistletoe' appear to have reported, and the Board of Admiralty by compensations have practically acknowledged that those in charge of the 'Alberta' were in the wrong, Her Majesty's Government ought, when life had been lost through that wrong, to have taken further steps to vindicate public justice" (*Mr. Anderson*) *v.*, 1486; after short debate, Question put, " That the words, &c.;" A. 157, N. 65; M. 92
- *The Coroner's Jury,* Questions, Mr. Anderson, Sir John Scourfield; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 27, 1761
  - Baron Bramwell's Letter . . *P.P.* 87
  - Papers relating to. 141

NELSON, Earl
- Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 645
- Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, Comm. [229] 1964
- Gas Light and Coke Company, Comm. [230] 1950

NEVILL, Mr. C. W., *Carmarthen, &c.*
- Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1394

NEVILLE-GRENVILLE, Mr. R., *Somersetshire, Mid*
- Army — Knightsbridge Barracks, Res. [227] 1761
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1390, 1398
- Fine Arts, Motion for an Address, [229] 303
- Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 260
- Post Office Cheques, [227] 258
- Royal Titles, 2R. [227] 1732; 3R. [228] 482
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1326

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
- Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. [231] 868
- Church Bodies (Gibraltar)—The Ordinances, Motion for an Address, [228] 769
- City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1151
- Consolidated Fund, 3R. [228] 566
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2051

[*cont.*

Newdegate, Mr. C. N.—*cont.*
- Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [231] 1148
- Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1492
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1404; *add. cl.* 1659, 1997, 2019; [231] 16; Consid. *cl.* 14, 481, 486, 490, 525, 532
- London Municipal Government, Res. [229] 1796
- Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1002, 1017
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Order—Balloting for Motions, Motion for Adjournment, [230] 14
  - Privilege—Irregular Petitions, [228] 1317, 1320, 1398, 1400, 1401, 1402, 1558, 1559, 1633; — Personal Explanation, [229] 583
  - Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1637
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [231] 707
- Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1878
- Prisons, 2R. [230] 313, 934
- Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1446
- Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 423; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [228] 303, 306, 308; 3R. 509
- University Education (Ireland), Leave, [229] 826
- University of Oxford, 2R. [229] 1747
- Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1695

New Forest, The
- *Legislation*, Question, Lord Henry Scott; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 27, [230] 1973
- *Inclosure at Stoneycross*, Questions, Mr. Cowper-Temple; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 4, [229] 34; *May* 30, 1425; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 7, [231] 702

Newfoundland Fisheries—The
- *Captain Erskine's Report*, Question, Captain G. E. Price; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 4, [228] 1177
- *The French Fishermen*, Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 21, [227] 554; Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 22, 676
- *The French Shore*, Question, Captain G. E. Price; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 15, [229] 667

Newport, Viscount, *Shropshire, N.*
- Army — Auxiliary Forces — The Yeomanry, [230] 851

Newspaper Registration, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Waddy, Mr. Ashley*)

c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 11 [Bill 64]
2R. [Dropped]

Noel, Right Hon. G. J., *Rutland*
- Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1848
- Public Schools—Uppingham School, [229] 49

Noel, Mr. E., *Dumfries, &c.*
- Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 214
- Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 39
- East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [231] 1034
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 11, [230] 1446; *add. cl.* 1665, 1707; Amendt. 1902, 1999
- India—Malay Peninsula—Birch, Mr., Murder of, [229] 1290;—Perak, State of, [228] 1577
- International Submarine Telegraphs, [228] 476
- Royal Style and Titles—The Native Princes of India, [227] 1867, 1868
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 156, 158

Nolan, Captain J. P., *Galway Co.*
- Ardglass Harbour Improvement, Comm. [230] 1763
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Army Recruiting, [229] 1635
  - Forage to Mounted Officers, [229] 1353
  - Irish Militia Regiments, [228] 1627
  - Militia Surgeons, [231] 970
  - Mobilization of the Forces—Army Estimates, [229] 1421
  - Mobilization Scheme, The New, [230] 366, 367
  - Pay of Soldiers and Marines, [227] 1771
  - Retirement and Promotion, Commission on, [231] 972
  - Royal Artillery—Lieutenant Colonels, [228] 1098;—Non-Commissioned Officers, [229] 1603
- Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 967
- Army Recruiting, Res. [227] 1209, 1219
- Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1752
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1253
  - Military Education, Establishments for, [229] 1655, 1657
  - Pay and Allowances, [227] 1487
  - Warlike and other Stores, [229] 1639, 1647
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1654
- Barbadoes—Riots, The—Governor Hennessy, [229] 151
- Cattle Disease (Ireland), [227] 402; 2R. 1778; Consid. [230] 2022
- Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland), Leave, [231] 664
- China, Res. [230] 569
- Church Bodies (Gibraltar)—The Ordinances, Motion for an Address, [228] 769
- Civil Departments (Employment of Soldiers), Nomination of Committee, Amendt. [229] 754
- Commons, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 1252
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2059
- Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 6, Motion for reporting Progress, [230] 1516
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 997
- East India—Christianity, Address for Papers, [227] 236
- Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 765, 787
- Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 100; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1298; *add. cl.* 1911; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 491, 542
- Erne Lough and River, Comm. [230] 1764

[*cont.*

NOLAN, Captain J. P.—*cont.*
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Irish Church Body — Emly Cathedral Church, [230] 1884, 1885
National Education — Teachers' Salaries, [228] 1832, 1910
National Schools, [229] 46
Poor Law—Clifden Union, [229] 487
Post Office—Ireland, Mail Routes in, [227] 227
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 778
Ireland—Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 308, 309
Ireland—National School Teachers Act, 1875, Res. [228] 237 ;—Non-Contributory Unions, 1986
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker), Res. [229] 1441
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1754 ; Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 144, 146 ; Schedule 4, 147
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 796
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [228] 1948
Municipal Privileges (Ireland), Consid. [231] 663
Mutiny, Consid. Amendt. [228] 1035, 1036
Navy—H.M.S. "Devastation," [227] 1207
Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. [230] 170
Parliament—Leitrim County Election—Captain O'Beirne, Motion for Adjournment, [230] 180, 183, 264
Privilege—Irregular Petitions, [228] 1634
Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1640
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [231] 711
Parliament—Referees on Private Bills, Nomination of Select Committee, Amendt. [227] 1496 ; Motion for Adjournment, *ib.*
Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 424
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1767, 1771
Prisons, Leave, [229] 1552
Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 19
Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, Amendt. [228] 339
Local Government Board, &c. [227] 517, 519
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [227] 1841
Pauper Lunatics (Ireland), [227] 1846
Public Education (Ireland), [231] 278, 280
Public Works in Ireland, [227] 1845
Revenue Departments, Motion for Adjournment, [228] 1877
Turkey—Geneva Convention, [231] 701
University Education (Ireland), Leave, [229] 827
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1364
Woolwich Arsenal, [228] 1462

North America—See title *United States*

NORTH, Lieut-Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1462
Navy—Royal Marines, [228] 1524
Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1446

NORTHBROOK, Earl of
Indian Government, Address for Papers, [231] 499
Slave Trade, 2R. [230] 734 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 849

NORTHCOTE, Right Hon. Sir S. H. (*see* Chancellor of the Exchequer)

NORTHUMBERLAND, Duke of
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [230] 1427, 1429 ; Amendt. 1430 ; *cl.* 19, Amendt. *ib.*
Noxious Vapours, [227] 791
Sulphurous Acid, &c., Address for a Royal Commission, [228] 600

Norwich and Boston (Suspension of Writ, &c.) Bill—*Afterwards*
Norwich and Boston (Corrupt Voters) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 10 [Bill 244]
Read 2° * *August* 9
Committee ; Report, after short debate *August* 10, [231] 1055
Considered * ; read 3° *August* 11
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *August* 12 (No. 234)
Read 2ª * ; Committee negatived ; read 3ª *August* 14
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 72]

NORWOOD, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. [231] 865
Barristers and Advocates Fees, 2R. [229] 307, 349
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 902
Maritime Contracts, Leave, [227] 154
228] Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, 548, 667, 901 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 909, 910 ; *cl.* 5, 1156, 1159 ; *cl.* 6, 1160 ; *cl.* 9, 1369 ; *cl.* 14, 1584, 1589 ; *cl.* 15, 1619 ; *cl.* 16, 1793 ; *cl.* 18, 1804 ; Amendt. 1806, 1809 ; *cl.* 27, 1918 ; *cl.* 30, 1920 ; *add. cl.* 1926, 1939, 1942, 1943
229] 67, 70, 95, 210, 225 ; Consid. *cl.* 11, 1070 ; *cl.* 22, 1080 ; *cl.* 31, Amendt. 1082
231] Lords Amendts. 695, 1171, 1177, 1182
Merchant Shipping Acts—Light Dues, [231] 421
Navy — H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of the, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1075
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [231] 709
Post Office — Postal Telegraph Department, Res. [228] 204
Prisons, 2R. [230] 300
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 846
Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 621, 635, 636

Notices to Quit (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Downing, Mr. Patrick Martin*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 27 [Bill 114]
Read 2° * *May* 18
Committee * ; Report *May* 22 [Bill 160]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 16

[*cont.*

Notices to Quit (Ireland) Bill—cont.
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 3 [Bill 226]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 6
Read 3º * *July* 7
Lords Amendts. [Bill 285]
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord O'Hagan*) *July* 10 (No. 165)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 21, [230] 1694
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day three months") (*The Lord Lifford*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2ª
Committee * *July* 25 (No. 188)
Report * *July* 31
Read 3ª * *August* 1
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 63]

Noxious Nuisances—Legislation
Question, Colonel Egerton Leigh; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 17, [227] 405

Noxious Vapours
Petition presented (*The Lord Winmarleigh*) *Feb* 23, [227] 790; after short debate, Petition to lie on the Table
A Royal Commission, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 18, [230] 1523

Nullum Tempus (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Meldon*)
c. Ordered; read 1º * *May* 24 [Bill 167]
Read 2º * *June* 13
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Considered * *July* 11
Read 3º * *July* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord O'Hagan*) *July* 13 (No. 171)
Read 2ª * *July* 20
Committee *; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 37]

O'BRIEN, Sir P., *King's Co.*
Army—Connaught Rangers, [227] 261
Commons, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 1252, 1253
India—Leprosy, [231] 700
Silver, Depreciation of, [227] 260
Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1205
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 1561
Metropolis—Street Accidents to Vans, &c. [228] 1482
National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, Res. [228] 239
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. [227] 1942
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 588
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, Res. [228] 1243
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 338
Supply—Report, [227] 999

O'CALLAGHAN, Hon. W. F. O., *Tipperary Co.*
Constabulary (Ireland)—North Riding of Tipperary, [228] 770

O'CLERY, Mr. K., *Wexford Co.*
Army—Mobilization—Wexford Militia, [230] 1817
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 771
Workhouse Schools (Ireland), [227] 1711

O'CONOR, Mr. D. M., *Sligo Co.*
Civil Service—Order in Council—Clause 12, [228] 1759
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. Amendt. [227] 2036
Monastic and Conventual Institutions, Petition, [229] 846

O'CONOR DON, The, *Roscommon Co.*
Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [230] 1678
Civil Bill Processes (Ireland), [228] 696
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [229] 1368
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 780
230] Elementary Education, 2R. 44; Comm. *cl.* 5,
. Amendt. 1300; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1411; *cl.* 14,
. 1453; *cl.* 34, 1513, 1514; *add. cl.* 1533,
. 1540, 1669, 1860, 1903
231] 25; Schedule 1, Amendt. 69; Amendt. 70
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 314
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1754; Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 146, 271
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 674
Public Houses (Ireland) — Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 502
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1334
Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [231] 276
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1756
University Education (Ireland), Leave, [229] 825

O'DONOGHUE, The, *Tralee*
Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 525
Ireland—Thurles Coronership, [230] 247
Irish Land Act — Compensation under Third Clause, [227] 135
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 271, 273
Land Tenure (Ireland), [227] 817; 2R. [228] 805
Land Tenure (Ireland), Address for a Royal Commission, [231] 1223
Parliament—Business of the House, Arrangement of, [227] 500, 501; [230] 1036
Relevancy of Debate—Appropriation Bill, [231] 1162
Supply — Public Education (Ireland), [231] 278
Tralee Savings Bank, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 1582, 1584

Offences against the Person Bill
(*Mr. Charley, Mr. Whitwell*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 1]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 10, [227] 138
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Wheelhouse*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee deferred, after short debate *Feb* 15, 331
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 1, 1188
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. P. A. Taylor*) *v.*; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 108, N. 82; M. 26
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—r.p.
Committee *—r.p. *Mar* 3
Committee *—r.p. *Mar* 6
Committee *—r.p. *April* 6
Committee—r.p. *April* 24, [228] 1622
Committee—r.p., after short debate *June* 13, [229] 1784
Committee *—r.p. *June* 20
Bill withdrawn * *August* 5

O'Gorman, Major P., *Waterford*
Criminal Law—Tichborne Case—Arthur Orton, [230] 248
Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 100
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 894, 896
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 809
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1164
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 577
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1366
Supply—Lord Privy Seal, [227] 502
Report, [227] 1000; [228] 588
Training Ships (Ireland), [230] 1049

O'Hagan, Lord
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [227] 924
Barbadoes, [231] 252
Irish Peerage, Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1902; Report, [229] 200
Juries Procedure (Ireland), 2R. [231] 497
Notices to Quit (Ireland), 2R. [230] 1694
Royal Irish Academy, Motion for Correspondence, [230] 489
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 1R. [228] 56; 2R. 1301; Report, [229] 763

O'Leary, Dr. W. H., *Drogheda*
Army—Army Medical School, [228] 882
Senior Surgeons Major, [230] 1048
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1020
Merchant Shipping Acts, 1875 and 1876—Surveyors, [230] 947

O'Leary, Dr. W. H.—*cont.*
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1003
Public Health (Ireland)—City of Dublin, [228] 1910
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1357, 1364

O'Loghlen, Right Hon. Sir C. M., *Clare Co.*
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. [229] 1705; Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 1159; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1160; *cl.* 8, [231] 769; Consid. *add. cl.* 872; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 880
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), 2R. [230] 535
Clerk of the Peace and of the Crown (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [229] 1338
Elections, Corrupt Practices at, [229] 918
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 142; Schedule 1, 143
Merchant Shipping, Consid. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [229] 1067; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1081
Parliament—Leitrim County Election—Captain O'Beirne, [230] 180
Poor Law Rating (Ireland), 2R. [229] 2024
Registry of Deeds (Ireland) — Mr. Dillon's System, [230] 1045
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1756; Comm. [230] 364

Onslow, Mr. D. R., *Guildford*
Bankers Books Evidence, Consid. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 937
229] Elementary Education, 2R. 1930
230] Comm. *cl.* 6, 1401; *cl.* 11, 1445; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1507; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 1510; Postponed *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1528, 1530; *add. cl.* 1663
231] 63
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 554
India—Bengal Famine, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1856
Intemperance—A Joint Committee, [230] 1042
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) (No. 2), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [228] 1888
Judicature Act (1873)—Surrey Assizes, [227] 302
Parliament—Privilege—Monastic and Conventual Institutions, [228] 1319
Royal Titles, 3R. [228] 486
Royal Titles Act Proclamation, Notice of Res. [229] 51
Supply, Report, [227] 996

Open Spaces (Metropolitan District) Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Sir George Bowyer*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 23 [Bill 86]
Read 2° * *Mar* 15
Committee *—r.p. *Mar* 17
Committee *Mar* 21, [228] 427; Moved, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); after short debate, Question put; A. 45, N. 29; M. 16 [No Report]

[*cont.*

RANMORE AND BROWNE, Lord
- Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. [228] 1383
- Confession, Motion for a Paper, [230] 1681
- Education—Reports for the Year 1875, [229] 1260
- Foreign Decorations, [229] 1268, 1414
- Irish Peerage, 2R. [228] 1172
- National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, [229] 360

rdnance Survey
- *Superannuations,* Question, Sir Frederick Perkins; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 10, [228] 1481
- *The Civil Assistants,* Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *Feb* 24, [227] 811
  - Report of Progress . . . . . [1412]

'REILLY, Mr. M. W., *Longford Co.*
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 711
- East India—Christianity, Address for Papers, [227] 230, 237
- India—Army—Orphans of Soldiers, Allowances to, [229] 369
  - Ecclesiastical Establishments, [227] 674
- Ireland—Education—"Results Examination," [228] 473; [230] 868
- Ireland—Constabulary Pensioners, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 571
- Ireland—National School Teachers Act, 1875, Res. [228] 241
- Ireland — Public Houses — Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 507
- Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 651
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 548
- Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 985
- Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 995
- Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 339
- Turkey—Insurgent Provinces, [230] 500

rphan and Deserted Children (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Bruen, Mr. Redmond*)
- Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 32]
- Read 2°, after short debate *July* 5, [230] 986
- Committee*; Report *July* 12
- Considered* *July* 13
- Read 3°* *July* 14
- Read 1ª* (*Lord Emly*) *July* 17 (No. 180)
- Read 2ª* *July* 21
- Committee*; Report *July* 25
- Read 3ª* *July* 27
- Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 38]

'SHAUGHNESSY, Mr. R., *Limerick*
- Ardglass Harbour Improvement, Comm. [230] 1763
- Army—Militia Adjutants, [228] 1759
- Army — Knightsbridge Barracks, Res. [227] 1766
- Cattle Disease (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1778; Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1037; Consid. [230] 2022

O'SHAUGHNESSY, Mr. R.—*cont.*
- Crab and Lobster Fisheries, [230] 1967
- Customs—Out-Door Officers at Outports, [228] 1478
- Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 479
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Coroner, Office of, [228] 475
  - Dogs Regulation Act, 1868—Petty Sessions Clerks, [231] 1200
  - Education, Intermediate, [227] 263
  - Fisheries — Trawling Vessels in Galway Bay, [228] 1408; [230] 1171
  - Inspectors of Irish Fisheries—Annual Reports, [230] 1966
- Ireland—Borough Franchise Res. [228] 730
- Ireland—Poor Law Rating, Res. [229] 837, 845
- Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [229] 2021
- Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 986
- Parliament—Privilege—Monastic and Conventual Institutions, [228] 1320
- Poor Law—Deportation of Female Paupers, [230] 613
- Poor Law Amendment, Comm. [228] 1470
- Poor Law Rating (Ireland), 2R. [229] 2024
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 112
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 353
- Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 340
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 349

O'SULLIVAN, Mr. W. H., *Limerick Co.*
- Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 787
- Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1185, 1215
- Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 819
- Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 995
- Poor Law Amendment, Consid. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 483
- Poor Law Rating (Ireland), Res. [229] 845
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1336, 1339, 1344
- Sheriffs (Ireland)—Levies, Retention of, [229] 773
- Supply, Report, [227] 999; Motion for Adjournment, 1000
- Ways and Means, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 1082

Outlawries Bill
- c. Read 1°* *Feb* 8

Owners of Land (England and Wales)—The New "Domesday Book"
- Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 24, [228] 1577; Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 27, 1758; Question, Sir Henry Jackson; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 16, [229] 1972
  - Summary of Returns . . . *P.P.* 353

OXFORD, Bishop of
Burials in Churchyards, 2R. [229] 1091
University of Oxford, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 941; *cl.* 16, 1306, 1307; *cl.* 19, 1309; *cl.* 25, 1314; *add. cl.* 1316

Oxford University Bill—See title **University of Oxford Bill**

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *May* 15 (No. 86)
Read 2ª* *May* 22
Committee*; Report *June* 1
Read 3ª* *June* 13
c. Read 1º* *June* 15 [Bill 196]
Read 2º* *June* 19
Committee*; Report *June* 29
Read 3º* *June* 30
l. Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 91]

Oyster Fisheries
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire what are the reasons for the present scarcity of Oysters, and what has been the effect of the measures relating to Oyster Fisheries adopted by Parliament subsequently to the Report of the Royal Commission on Sea Fisheries in 1866" (*Sir Charles Legard*) *Mar* 6, [227] 1498
Amendt. to add "and to report what further legislative measures may, in the opinion of the Committee, be desirable" (*Mr. Cawley*); Question, "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to
Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
And, on *Mar* 9, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Charles Legard (Chairman), Mr. Ashbury, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Herbert, Viscount Holmesdale, Colonel Learmonth, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Malcolm, Mr. Wykeham Martin, Mr. O'Conor, Mr. Pemberton, Lord Rendlesham, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Eustace Smith, Mr. Edward Stanhope, Mr. Arthur Vivian, Mr. Waddy, and Mr. F. Walpole; *Mar* 15, Lord Claud Hamilton, Mr. Fuller Maitland *added*; *April* 6, Sir Robert Buxton *added*
Report of Select Comm. *July* 7 *P.P.* 345

Oyster Fisheries—Herne Bay
Questions, Mr. Pemberton; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 20, [228] 266; *July* 28, [231] 8
Mr. Walpole's Report . . . *P.P.* 65

Oyster Fisheries Bill
(*Mr. Waddy, Mr. Muntz*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 11 [Bill 65]
2R. [Dropped]

PAGET, Mr. R. H., *Somersetshire, Mid*
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1242; *cl.* 5, 1298; Amendt. 1300; *cl.* 20, 1499; Postponed *cl.* 8, 1529
Local Finance, [227] 1122
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1773, 1774
Prisons, Leave, [229] 1552; 2R. [230] 314

PALMER, Mr. C. M., *Durham, N.*
Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1046
Merchant Shipping, Comm. [228] 527; *cl.* 3, 907; *cl.* 16, 1800; *add. cl.* 1935; [229] 78, 232
Navy—Troop Ship "Orontes," [227] 928

Paris, Declaration of, 1856
Resolution, Mr. Percy Wyndham *July* 14, [230] 1457 [House counted out]
Resolutions, Observations, The Earl of Denbigh; Reply, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *July* 17, 1457

Parish Ministers (Scotland) (Exemption from Rates) Bill
(*Mr. James Barclay, Mr. Baxter, Mr. M'Laren, Dr. Cameron*)
c. Ordered: read 1º* *Feb* 9 [Bill 37]
2R. [Dropped]

Parliament
LORDS—
MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT *Feb* 8
The Parliament opened by THE QUEEN in Person

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech
227] delivered by The LORD CHANCELLOR *Feb* 8, 2
An ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY thereon moved by The Earl of ABERDEEN (the Motion being seconded by The Earl of ELLESMERE), and, after long debate, agreed to, *Nemine Dissentiente* *Feb* 8, 6

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Feb* 10, 124

Chairman of Committees—The Lord Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Feb* 8
Ordered that the Viscount Eversley do take the Chair in all Committees upon Private Bills in the absence of the Lord Redesdale from illness *Feb* 28

Committee for Privileges—appointed *Feb* 8
Sub-Committee for the Journals—appointed *Feb* 8
Appeal Committee—appointed *Feb* 8

ROLL OF THE LORDS—Garter King of Arms attending, delivered at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the Third Session of the Twenty-first Parliament of the United Kingdom *Feb* 8, 6
The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table (No. 4) *Feb* 11

[*cont.*

RLIAMENT—LORDS—cont.

Chairman of Committees, Moved that the Lord Winmarleigh be appointed to take the Chair in the Committees of the Whole House in the absence of the Lord Redesdale *Mar* 31, *April* 6: Agreed to

Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod—Select Committee on, appointed *Mar* 31: The Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Saint Albans, Ld. Chamberlain, M. Lansdowne, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, Ld. Steward, E. Devon, E. Doncaster, E. Tankerville, E. Carnarvon, E. Granville, E. Kimberley, E. Sydney, V. Hawarden, V. Hardinge, V. Eversley, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Skelmersdale, and L. Aveland

First and Second Reports. *P.P. l.* 56, 166

rivate Bill Legislation

Orders in relation to Petitions *Feb* 18, [227] 474

Private Bills—Standing Orders Committee on, appointed *Feb* 21; The Lords following, with the Chairman of Committees, were named of the Committee:—D. Somerset, Ld. Chamberlain, M. Winchester, M. Lansdowne, M. Bath, M. Ailesbury, E. Devon, E. Airlie, E. Carnarvon, E. Cadogan, E. Belmore, E. Chichester, E. Powis, E. Verulam, E. Morley, E. Stradbroke, E. Amherst, E. Sydney, V. Hawarden, V. Hutchinson, V. Hardinge, V. Eversley, V. Halifax, V. Portman, L. Camoys, L. Saye and Sele, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Digby, L. Sheffield, L. Colchester, L. Silchester, L. De Tabley, L. Skelmersdale, L. Belper, L. Ebury, L. Egerton, L. Hartismere, L. Hylton, and L. Penrhyn

Opposed Private Bills—The Lords following, viz.:—M. Lansdowne, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, and L. Skelmersdale were appointed, with the Chairman of Committees, a Committee to select and propose to the House the names of the five Lords to form a Select Committee for the consideration of each opposed Private Bill *Feb* 21

rivate Bills

Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Monday the 19th day of June next [And other Orders] *April* 7, [228] 1378

Ordered, That the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Whitsuntide, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess *May* 29

Standing Orders 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 23, 26, 33, 34, 36, 38*a*, 43, 56, 58, 60, 62, 66, 67, 89, 104, 122, 123, 127, 133, 138, and 139 considered, and amended; and to be printed as amended (*The Chairman of Committees*) *August* 11 (No. 232)

[*Private Bills*—See title *Parliamentary Agency*]

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

The Easter Recess—House adjourned on Friday 7th April, to Thursday 27th April

The Whitsuntide Recess, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *May* 26, [229] 1254

House adjourned on Thursday 1st June to Tuesday 13th June

[See title *Parliament—Appellate Jurisdiction Act,* 1876

COMMONS—

227] The QUEEN'S SPEECH having been reported; An humble Address thereon moved by Mr. RIDLEY (the Motion being seconded by Mr. MULHOLLAND) *Feb* 8, 52; after long debate, Motion agreed to; and a Committee appointed to draw up the said Address

Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Ridley (Chairman), Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Attorney General, Viscount Barrington, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Disraeli, Sir William Hart Dyke, Sir James Elphinstone, Mr. Secretary Hardy, Mr. Ward Hunt, Lord John Manners, Mr. Mulholland, Viscount Sandon, Mr. Sclater-Booth, and Mr. William Henry Smith

Report of Address brought up, and read *Feb* 9, 115; after short debate, Address agreed to; to be presented by Privy Councillors

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Feb* 11, 230

Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (*House of Commons*)—Standing Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 10, as follows:—Mr. Adam (Chairman), Mr. Dick, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Goldney, Captain Hayter, Lord Kensington, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Stacpoole, and Sir H. Drummond Wolff

Printing—Select Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 9, as follows:—Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Henley, Mr. Ward Hunt, Mr. Massey, Captain Nolan, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Spencer Walpole, and Mr. Whitbread

Privileges—Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed *Feb* 8

Public Accounts—Committee nominated *Feb* 11, as follows:—Mr. Dodson (Chairman), Sir W. B. Barttelot, Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. Cubitt, Lord Eslington, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Hankey, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Seely, and Mr. William Henry Smith

1st and 2nd Reports of Select Comm. *Mar* 24, *May* 3 *P.P.* Nos. 133, 207

Public Petitions—Select Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 14, as follows:—Sir Charles Forster (Chairman), Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. William Ormsby Gore, Earl de Grey, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. O'Conor, The O'Donoghue, Lord Arthur Russell, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Sandford, Mr. Simonds, and Mr. Reginald Yorke

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

Railway and Canal Bills, General Committee on—A Sessional Committee, nominated by the Committee of Selection, as follows:—Mr. Basil Woodd (Chairman), Mr. Evans, Mr. Julian Goldsmid, Mr. Leveson Gower, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir John Kennaway, Earl of March, Mr. Arthur Mills, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Ridley, and Mr. J. G. Talbot; *Mar* 3, Mr. W. W. Beach *disch.; June* 27, Mr. Backhouse *added*

Selection—Committee of, nominated *Feb* 10, as follows:—Mr. Mowbray (Chairman), Mr. Hankey, Sir Graham Montgomery, The O'Conor Don, Sir John Scourfield, and Mr. Whitbread; *June* 15, Mr. Neville-Grenville *added*

Standing Orders—Select Committee nominated *Feb* 10, as follows:—Mr. Mowbray (Chairman), Mr. Bruen, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Hankey, Mr. Howard, Sir Graham Montgomery, The O'Conor Don, Sir John Scourfield, and Mr. Whitbread; *June* 15, Mr. Neville-Grenville *added*

Standing Orders Revision—Select Committee nominated *August* 7, as follows:—Mr. Raikes (Chairman), Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bristowe, Mr. Stephen Cave, Sir Charles Forster, Viscount Galway, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Hankey, Sir Henry Holland, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Monk, Colonel North, Mr. Serjeant Simon, and Sir H. Drummond Wolff

Adjournment, Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *July* 13; Question put; A. 68, N. 11; M. 57

Order

Balloting for Motions, Observations, Mr. Anderson; Reply, Mr. Speaker *June* 19, [230] 11

Moved, "That the House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Newdegate*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Notices of Motion, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 9, [227] 1718

Priority for Motions, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answers, Mr. Percy Wyndham, Mr. Speaker *June* 22, [230] 259

Orders of the Day—The Irish Land Bill, Observations, The O'Donoghue; short debate thereon *Feb* 18, [227] 501

Private Bills—Solicitation of Votes—See that title

Reference to Debates in the House of Lords, Observations, Earl Percy; Reply, Mr. Disraeli; short debate thereon *June* 9, [229] 1622

Private Bills

Private Bill Legislation, Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 7, [230] 1135

Ordered, That Standing Order 131 be suspended; and that the time for depositing Petitions against Private Bills, or against any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order, or Provisional Certificate, be extended to Thursday the 8th day of this instant June (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *June* 1

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

Privilege

Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868—*Corrupt Practices at Elections*, Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 18, [229] 918;—*Boston Election*, Questions, Mr. J. R. Yorke, Mr. Ingram; Answers, The Attorney General *Mar* 21, [228] 349; Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 10, 1480;—*Norwich and Boston Election Commissions*, Questions, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 22, [229] 1035; *May* 29, 1345;—*Yarmouth Election*, Question, Sir Edmund Lacon; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 15, [229] 1896;—*Leitrim County Election—Captain O'Beirne*, Question, Observations, Captain Nolan *June* 21, [230] 179

Moved, "That the House do now adjourn" (*Captain Nolan*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Observations, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Captain Nolan *June* 22, [230] 261

Lords Lieutenant, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 3, [230] 854

Privy Council (*Oaths taken by Members, &c.*) —*Use of Her Majesty's Name—Mr. Lowe's Speech at Retford*, Personal Statement, Mr. Lowe *May* 4, [229] 52 [See that title]

The Suez Canal Shares Contract—22 *Geo. III. c.* 45—*The Messrs. Rothschild*, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Disraeli; Personal Statement, Sir Nathaniel Rothschild *Feb* 28, [227] 1019

Public Petitions—Grants of Money, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Sir Charles Forster *June* 22, [230] 248

Trial of Election Petitions — Legislation, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 4, [229] 37

Public Business

Arrangement of Public Business, Observations,
Question, The Marquess of Hartington;
Reply, Mr. Disraeli; short debate thereon
228] *April* 4, 1181; Question, Mr. Beckett-
Denison; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington;
short debate thereon *April* 6,
1328; Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr.
Fawcett; Answers, Mr. Disraeli *May* 5,
229] 107; Questions, The Marquess of Hartington,
Lord Eslington, Mr. Serjeant Sherlock;
Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer,
Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 12, 491;
Questions, Mr. Beresford Hope, The Marquess
of Hartington; Answer, Mr. Disraeli
May 22, 1053; Observations, The Marquess
of Hartington; Reply, Mr. Disraeli; debate
thereon *May* 25, 1195; Question, The
Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The
Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 26,
1275; Question, Captain Pim; Answer,
Mr. Disraeli *June* 12, 1666; Questions, Mr.
Charles Lewis, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Sir
Walter Barttelot; Answers, Mr. Disraeli
230] *June* 19, 8; Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster,
Mr. Beresford Hope, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice;
Answers, Mr. Disraeli *June* 20,
129; Observations, The Chancellor of the
Exchequer *June* 23, 365; Question, Observations,
The Marquess of Hartington;

[*cont.*

LIAMENT—COMMONS—*Public Business—cont.*

] Reply, Mr. Disraeli *June* 26, 429; Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Morgan Lloyd, General Sir George Balfour; Answers, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 29, 621; Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, Mr. Disraeli; debate thereon *July* 20, 1631; Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *July* 26, 1912; Observations, Question, Mr. Goschen; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *July* 27, 1974;—*Ministerial Statement*, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 31, 122; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 4, 550

rdered, That on Tuesdays Orders of the Day have priority over Notices of Motion; Government Orders to have priority on Wednesdays *August* 7, [231] 704

arliamentary Reporting, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 14, [231] 1198

elevancy of Debate—The Appropriation Bill, Observations, Mr. E. Jenkins; Reply, Mr. Speaker: short debate thereon *August* 12, [231] 1158

cotch Bills, Question, Mr. Leith; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 25, [229] 1195; Questions, Sir George Campell, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross, Mr. Disraeli *May* 29, 1356; Observations, Sir George Campbell; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross; short debate thereon *June* 16, 2015

he Budget—Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 26, [228] 1744; Questions, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 27, 1762

usiness of the House

uestions, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Goschen; Answers, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Disraeli *August* 10, [231] 977

ommencement of Public Business, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 28, [228] 1837; Observations, Mr. Disraeli *May* 1, 1912; Observation, Mr. Seely; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *May* 2, 1986

orning Sittings, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 8, [229] 1554

sh Wednesday, Moved, "That this House do meet To-morrow, at Two of the clock" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *Feb* 29, [227] 1124; after short debate, Motion agreed to

he Easter Recess, Questions, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Pease; Answers, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Hunt, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 3, [228] 1100

he House adjourned on Tuesday 11th April to Monday 24th April

scension Day, Ordered, That Committees shall not sit upon Thursday, being Ascension Day, until Two of the clock, and have leave to sit until Six of the clock, notwithstanding the sitting of the House (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *May* 23

he Derby Day—Adjournment of the House, Question, Mr. James; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 26, [229] 1275

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*Business of the House—cont.*

Moved, "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday next" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *May* 30, 1425; after short debate, Question put; A. 207, N. 118; M. 89

Whitsuntide Recess—Arrangement of Public Business, Moved, "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday next" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *June* 1, [229] 1522; after short debate, Motion agreed to

The House adjourned accordingly

Palace of Westminster

Cab Shelter in Palace Yard, Question, Mr. Benett-Stanford; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 4, [229] 48

Mr. Herbert's Picture, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *June* 1, [229] 1514

The Clock Tower, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 18, [229] 917

The Ladies' Galleries, Observations, Mr. Serjeant Sherlock; Reply, Lord John Manners; debate thereon *Mar* 24, [228] 579;—*Exclusion of Strangers*, Statement of Mr. Speaker *July* 19, [230] 1553

Parliament—Appeals and Causes in Error —Standing Order

Moved to resolve, That no Appeal or Cause in Error shall be heard and determined unless there be present at such hearing and determination not less than three Lords holding, or who have held, some of the following high judicial offices; that is to say, the office of Lord Chancellor of Great Britain or Ireland, or of Judge of one of the Superior Courts of Law or Equity in England, or of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice or Court of Appeal in England, or of the Court of Session in Scotland, or of the Superior Courts of Law or Equity in Ireland" (*The Lord Redesdale*) *Mar* 2, [227] 1200; after short debate, on Question? resolved in the affirmative

Ordered, That the said Resolution be declared a Standing Order, and that it be entered on the Roll of Standing Orders of this House

Parliament—Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876

Ordered, "That this House do meet on Tuesday the 21st of November next for the purpose of hearing and determining Appeals and Matters connected therewith, pursuant to the provisions of 'The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876'" *August* 14

Judicial Business of this House—Standing Orders—Ordered, That the following Standing Orders do regulate all Appeals presented to the House on and after the 1st day of November 1876:

[Then the said Standing Orders are set out at length—p. 1194]

Ordered, That the said Standing Orders be entered on the Roll of Standing Orders of this House

Ordered, That the said Orders be printed and published, to the end all persons concerned may the better take notice of the same

Parliament—Business of the House—Committees of Supply
Moved, "That whenever notice has been given that Estimates will be moved in Committee of Supply, and the Committee stands as the first Order of the Day upon any day except Thursday and Friday, on which Government Orders have precedence, the Speaker shall, when the Order for the Committee has been read, forthwith leave the Chair without putting any Question, and the House shall thereupon resolve itself into such Committee, unless on first going into Committee on the Army, Navy, or Civil Service Estimates respectively an Amendment be moved relating to the division of Estimates proposed to be considered on that day" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *Feb* 17, [227] 469 ; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*) ; Question put ; A. 44, N. 136 ; M. 92
Question again proposed
Amendt. in line 7, to leave out the word "first" (*Mr. Secretary Hardy*) ; after short debate, Question, "That the word 'first,' &c.," put, and negatived
Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Parliament—Business of the House—Arrangement of Public Business
Moved, "That upon Tuesdays Orders of the Day have precedence over Notices of Motion, Government Orders having priority, and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *August* 7, [231] 704
Amendt. to leave out "and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays" (*Mr. Butt*) ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Question put ; A. 99, N. 45 ; M. 54
Main Question put, and agreed to

Parliament — Exclusion of Strangers— Order, 1875
Notice taken, that Strangers are present *Mar* 5, [227] 1404
Whereupon Mr. Speaker read the Resolution on the subject which was adopted by the House last Session, and stated that unless otherwise directed by the House he should abide by that Resolution. He accordingly, without further debate, put the Question, "That Strangers be ordered to withdraw ;" A. 6, N. 16 ; and Forty Members not being present, the House was adjourned—*Petition of Mr. C. Henwood*
Observations, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 6, 1420
Question, Mr. Dodson ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 10, [228] 1480 ; Question, Mr. Charles
229] Lewis ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 29, 1355
Moved, "That the Order of the 31st day of May 1875, relative to the Exclusion of Strangers, be made a Sessional Order" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *May* 30, 1494
Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Rylands*) ; after short debate, Motion agreed to

[cont.

Parliament — Exclusion of Strangers — Order, 1875—cont.
229] Question, Mr. Charles Lewis ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 8, 1555
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate *June* 13, 1819
Moved, "That the debate be further adjourned till Tuesday next" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir H. Drummond Wolff*) ; Question put, and agreed to
Observations, Mr. Mitchell Henry *July* 19, [230] 1552
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*) ; after short debate, Notice taken, that Strangers are present (*Mr. Callan*)
Mr. Speaker forthwith put the Question, "That Strangers be ordered to withdraw ;" and it passed in the Negative ; original Motion withdrawn

Parliament—Opposed Business
Moved, "That, except for a Money Bill, no Order of the Day or Notice of Motion be taken after half-past Twelve of the clock at night with respect to which Order or Notice of Motion a Notice of Opposition or Amendment shall have been printed on the Notice Paper, or if such Notice of Motion shall only have been given the next previous day of sitting, and objection shall be taken when such Notice is called" (*Mr. Heygate*) *Feb* 10, [227] 186 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Parliament—Private Bill Committees—The Referees
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 18, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report on the position of the Referees of the House on Private Bills, and particularly as to the legality and expediency of allowing the Referees the same power of voting on a Private Bill Committee as a Member of Parliament regularly elected by a constituency" (*Mr. Anderson*) *v.*, [227] 485 ; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived ; words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Moved, "That the Select Committee on Referees on Private Bills do consist of Twenty-one Members" (*Mr. Anderson*) *Mar* 6, 1495
Amendt. to leave out "Twenty-one," and insert "Twenty-three" (*Mr. Sullivan*) *v.* ; after short debate, Question put, "That 'Twenty-one,' &c. ;" A. 73, N. 21 ; M. 52
Moved, "That Mr. Spencer Walpole be a Member of the said Committee ;" A. 79, N. 11 ; M. 68
Moved, "That Mr. Dodson be one other Member of the said Committee ;" A. 77, N. 11 ; M. 66
Moved, "That Mr. Mowbray be one other Member of the said Committee ;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Captain Nolan*) ; A. 17, N. 68 ; M. 51

[cont.

Parliament — Private Bill Committees — The Referees—cont

Question put, "That Mr. Mowbray be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 76, N. 10; M. 66

Moved, "That Mr. Sclater-Booth be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 74, N. 9; M. 65

Sir Edward Colebrooke nominated

Moved, "That Mr. Pemberton be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 74, N. 9; M. 65

Moved, "That Mr. Whitbread be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 74, N. 9; M. 65

Moved, "That Mr. Basil Woodd be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 74, N. 9; M. 65

Moved, "That Sir John St. Aubyn be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 74, N. 7; M. 66

Mr. Kavanagh and The O'Conor Don nominated

Moved, "That Mr. Heygate be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 71, N. 7; M. 64

Sir Francis Goldsmid nominated

Moved, "That Mr. Mills be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 75, N. 3; M. 72

Mr. Dillwyn nominated

Moved, "That Mr. Rodwell be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 74, N. 3; M. 71

Moved, "That Mr. Monk be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 74, N. 3; M. 71

Moved, "That Mr. Staveley Hill be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 75, N. 3; M. 72

Moved, "That Mr. Muntz be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 75, N. 3; M. 72

Moved, "That Mr. John Talbot be one other Member of the said Committee;" A. 74, N. 3; M. 71

Mr. Anderson nominated

Mar 14, The O'Conor Don *disch.;* Mr. Butt *added*

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to Committees on Private Bills, that Referees, appointed to such Committees, may take part in all the proceedings thereof, but without the power of voting" (*Mr. Mowbray*) *Mar* 27, [228] 613; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

Parliament — Private Bills — Solicitation of Members

Moved, "That the solicitation of Members of this House to oppose or support Private Bills on Second Reading by Members connected in any way with interests concerned in that opposition or support, has a tendency to restore the evils which this House sought to redress by the present system of Private Bill Committees chosen by a Committee of Selection" (*Sir Edward Watkin*) *Mar* 6, [227] 1491; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Explanation, Sir Edward Watkin; short debate thereon *July* 3, [230] 860

Parliament — Privilege — Political Committee of the Reform Club

Complaint made by Sir William Fraser, bart., Member for Kidderminster, of a certain Letter addressed by Mr. Lewis Morris to Henry William Ripley, esquire, Member for Bradford, in breach of the privileges of this House:—after debate,

Moved, "That Mr. Lewis Morris, the writer of the said Letter, do attend at the Bar of this House on Monday next, at a quarter past Four of the clock" (*Sir William Fraser*) *June* 12, [229] 1669; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Parliament—Privilege—Public Petitions

Notice taken of the language of Petitions in favour of the Monastic and Conventual Institutions Bill from Kensington [presented 28th March]; from Broadstairs [presented 28th March]; and from Avebury [presented 31st March]; and doubts having been expressed whether the name of the Honourable Member which appeared upon those Petitions had been affixed by his authority,

Moved, "That the Order, That the Petition from Kensington [presented 28th March] do lie upon the Table, be read, and discharged"
228] (*Mr. Callan*) *April* 7, 1395; after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir William Fraser*); Motion withdrawn

Original Question put, and agreed to; Ordered, That the Petition be withdrawn

Ordered, That the Order, That the Petition from Broadstairs [presented 28th March] do lie upon the Table, be read, and discharged; Ordered, That the Petition be withdrawn

Ordered, That the Order, That the Petition from Avebury [presented 31st March] do lie upon the Table, be read, and discharged; Ordered, That the Petition be withdrawn

Notice taken, that the name of Mr. Newdegate, Member for North Warwickshire, had been affixed without his authority to a Petition from Chatham, in favour of the Monastic and Conventual Institutions Bill, presented upon the 30th day of March last,

Observations, Mr. Newdegate; short debate thereon *April* 6, 1317

Ordered, That the Order that the said Petition do lie upon the Table be read, and discharged; Petition withdrawn

Irregular Petitions, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Speaker; short debate thereon *April* 11, 1557; Observations, Mr. Newdegate, Captain Nolan *April* 25, 1633; Personal Explanation, Mr. Newdegate; short
229] debate thereon *May* 12, 583

Notice being taken of the language contained in the Petition from Newark Street, Leicester, in favour of the Monastic and Conventual Institutions Bill,

Moved, "That the Order that the Petition do lie upon the Table be read, and discharged, on account of the unbecoming language used therein" (*Mr. Callan*) *May* 16, 845; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Ordered, That the Order that the Petition do lie upon the Table be read, and discharged, on account of the unbecoming language used therein

Parliament — Privilege — Public Petitions —Petition of Mr. Charles Henwood

Moved, "That the Petition of Mr. Charles Henwood, presented upon the 16th day of February last, be printed and distributed with the Votes" (*Colonel Beresford*) *Mar* 3, [227] 1404

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Order that the Petition of Mr. Charles Henwood do lie upon the Table be read, and discharged" (*Mr. Hunt*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate—

Forty Members not being present, the House was adjourned

Moved, "That the Petition of Mr. Charles Henwood [presented 16th February] be printed with the Votes" (*Colonel Beresford*) *Mar* 20, [228] 342

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Order that the Petition do lie upon the Table be read, and discharged" (*Mr. Goldsmid*) *v.*; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived

Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Ordered, That the Order that the Petition do lie upon the Table be read, and discharged

Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Colonel
229] Beresford *May* 22, 1038

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 9, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the case of Mr. Charles Henwood" (*Colonel Beresford*) *v.*, 1609; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 13, 1763

Parliament — Privilege — Public Petitions — Petition from a foreign Town— Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate)

228] Observations, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Reply, Mr. Speaker *April* 6, 1321

A Petition of Inhabitants of Boulogne-sur-Mer relative to the British Consulate in that Town having been offered to be presented,

Moved, "That the Petition do lie upon the Table" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *April* 7, 1411; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Observations, Lord Robert Montagu; Reply, Mr. Speaker *April* 10, 1485

Select Committee appointed "to consider a Petition addressed to this House by Inhabitants of the Town of Boulogne-sur-Mer in France, and to report upon the advisability of the reception of such Petition by the House" *May* 5

Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Secretary Hardy (Chairman), Mr. Bourke, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Dodson, Lord Elcho, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Spencer Walpole, Mr. Whitbread, Sir John Eardley Wilmot, Sir H. Drummond Wolff

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read *May* 16, [229] 847 *P.P.* No. 232

Parliament — The Electoral System — Borough and County Constituencies

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it would be desirable to adopt an uniform Parliamentary Franchise for Borough and County Constituencies" (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *May* 30, [229] 1442; after long debate, Question put; A. 165, N. 264; M. 99

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF LORDS

New Peers

Feb 8—John Ralph Ormsby-Gore, esquire, created Baron Harlech of Harlech

John Tollemache, esquire, created Baron Tollemache of Helmingham Hall

Sir Robert Tolver Gerard, baronet, created Baron Gerard of Bryn

Feb 10—William Earl of Abergavenny, created Earl of Lewes and Marquess of Abergavenny

Edward Montagu Stuart Granville, Baron Wharncliffe, created Viscount Carlton of Carlton and Earl of Wharncliffe

Feb 17—Henry Gerard Sturt, esquire, created Baron Alington of Crichel

June 15—Thomas George Lord Northbrook, G.C.S.I., created Viscount Baring of Lee in the county of Kent, and Earl of Northbrook in the county of Southampton

Sat First

Feb 8—The Lord Dorchester, after the death of his Cousin

Feb 11—The Lord Westbury, after the death of his Grandfather

Feb 17—Earl Stanhope, after the death of his Father

May 8—Charles Edward Hastings Lord Hastings, after the death of his Mother

May 15—The Viscount Leinster, after the death of his Father

May 29—The Earl of Huntingdon, after the death of his Father

July 13—The Earl Howe, after the death of his Brother

July 25—The Lord Hylton, after the death of his Father

July 31—The Lord De Freyne, after the death of his Father

August 1—The Lord Harlech, after the death of his Brother

Representative Peer for Ireland

(Writ and Return)

Mar 17—Lord Massy, *v.* Viscount de Vesci, deceased

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF COMMONS

New Writs Issued

During Recess

For Suffolk (Western Division), *v.* Fuller Maitland Wilson, esquire, deceased

[*cont.*

Parliament — Commons—*New Writs Issued*—

For Lancaster County (South Western Division), *v.* Charles Turner, esquire, deceased
For Surrey (Middle Division), *v.* Sir Richard Baggallay, knight, Judge of Her Majesty's Court of Appeal
For Whitehaven, *v.* George Augustus Frederick Cavendish Bentinck, esquire, Judge Advocate General
For Aberdeen County (Eastern Division), *v.* William Dingwall Fordyce, esquire, deceased
For Horsham, *v.* Right honble. Sir William Seymour Vesey Fitzgerald, Chief Charity Commissioner for England and Wales
For Ipswich, *v.* John Patteson Cobbold, esquire, deceased
For Wilts (Southern Division), *v.* Lord Henry Frederick Thynne, Treasurer of Her Majesty's Household
For Salop (Northern Division), *v.* John Ralph Ormsby-Gore, esquire, now Baron Harlech
For Dorset, *v.* Henry Gerard Sturt, esquire, now Baron Alington
For Burnley, *v.* Richard Shaw, esquire, deceased
For Suffolk (Eastern Division), *v.* Viscount Mahon, now Earl Stanhope
For Armagh Borough, *v.* John Vance, esquire, deceased

1876
Feb 8—*For* Berkshire, *v.* Richard Benyon, esquire, Manor of Northstead
For Leominster, *v.* Richard Arkwright, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
For Manchester, *v.* William Romaine Callender, esquire, deceased
Feb 9—*For* Huntingdon Borough, *v.* Sir John Burgess Karslake, knight, Manor of Northstead
For Enniskillen Borough, *v.* Viscount Crichton, Commissioner of the Treasury
Feb 14—*For* East Retford, *v.* Viscount Galway, deceased
Feb 21—*For* Horsham, *v.* Robert Henry Hurst, esquire, void Election
April 7—*For* Norfolk (Northern Division), *v.* the Hon. Frederick Walpole, deceased
April 10—*For* East Cumberland, *v.* William Nicholas Hodgson, esquire, deceased
April 25—*For* Aberdeen County (Western Division), *v.* William M'Combie, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
May 12—*For* Cork City, *v.* Joseph Philip Ronayne, esquire, deceased
June 12—*For* Pembroke County, *v.* Sir John Henry Scourfield, baronet, deceased
June 22—*For* Birmingham, *v.* George Dixon, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
June 29—*For* Worcester County (Western Division), *v.* William Edward Dowdeswell, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds

[*cont.*

Parliament — Commons —*New Writs Issued*—

July 3—*For* Leitrim County, *v.* Major William Richard Ormsby Gore, now Baron Harlech, called up to the House of Peers
July 7—*For* Chester County (Mid Division), *v.* Egerton Leigh, esquire, deceased.
July 17—*For* Kent County (Eastern Division), *v.* Sir Wyndham Knatchbull, baronet, Chiltern Hundreds
July 25—*For* New Shoreham, *v.* Sir Percy Burrell, baronet, deceased
August 5—*For* Leeds, *v.* Robert Meek Carter, esquire, Manor of Northstead
August 7—For Carmarthen Borough, *v.* Charles William Nevill, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
August 9—*For* Rutland, *v.* the Right honble. Gerard James Noel, First Commissioner of Works and Buildings
August 14—*For* Donegal, *v.* Thomas Conolly esquire, deceased

New Members Sworn

Feb 8—John Ireland Blackburne, esquire, *Lancaster County* (South Western Division)
Thomas Thornhill, esquire, *Suffolk* (Western Division)
Daniel Thwaites, esquire, *Blackburn*
Lord Henry Frederick Thynne, *Wilts* (Southern Division)
Robert Henry Hurst, esquire, *Horsham*
Honble. Edward Henry Trafalgar Digby, *Dorset*
Sir James John Trevor Lawrence, baronet, *Surrey* (Middle Division)
Thomas Clement Cobbold, esquire, *Ipswich*
Sir Alexander Hamilton Gordon, *Aberdeen County* (Eastern Division)
George De La Poer Beresford, esquire, *Armagh Borough*
Stanley Leighton, esquire, *Salop* (Northern Division)
Right honble. George Augustus Cavendish Bentinck, *Whitehaven*
Feb 17—Viscount Hinchingbrook, *Huntingdon Borough*
Thomas Blake, esquire, *Leominster*
Feb 21—Viscount Crichton, *Enniskillen*
Peter Rylands, esquire, *Burnley*
Feb 24—Jacob Bright, esquire (made affirmation), *Manchester*
Frederick St. John Newdegate Barne, esquire, *Suffolk County* (Eastern Division)
Feb 25—Philip Wroughton, esquire, *Berkshire*
Mar 2—William Beckett Denison, esquire, *East Retford*
James Clifton Brown, esquire, *Horsham*
April 27—James Duff, esquire, *Norfolk County* (Northern Division)
May 1—Edward Stafford Howard, esquire, *Cumberland County* (Eastern Division)
May 15—Lord Douglas William Cope Gordon, *Aberdeen County* (Western Division)

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*New Members Sworn—*
May 30—William Goulding, esquire, *Cork City*
July 7—James Bevan Bowen, esquire, *Pembroke County*
July 10—Sir Edmund Anthony Harley Lechmere, baronet, *Worcester County* (Western Division)
July 13—Joseph Chamberlain, esquire, *Birmingham*
July 19—Piers Egerton Warburton, esquire, *Chester County* (Mid Division)
July 21—Francis O'Beirne, esquire, *Leitrim County*
July 28—William Deedes, esquire, *Kent County* (Eastern Division)
August 7—Sir Walter Wyndham Burrell, baronet, *New Shoreham*
August 15—Emile Algernon Arthur Keppell Cowell Stepney, esquire, *Carmarthen Borough*

Parliamentary Agents
l. Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to join with a Committee of the Commons to consider the expediency of making further regulations concerning the admission and practice of Parliamentary agents, and to report their opinion thereon" (*The Lord*
230] *Redesdale*) *June* 23, 316; Motion agreed to
The following Lords named of the Committee: —M. Lansdowne, E. Doncaster, E. Camperdown, L. Redesdale, L. Penrhyn
And a message sent to the Commons to acquaint them that this House has appointed a committee of five Lords to join with a committee of the Commons; and to request that the Commons will be pleased to appoint an equal number of members to be joined with the members of this House
c. Lords Message considered *June* 28, 573
Moved, "That a Select Committee of five Members be appointed to join with the Committee of five Lords (as mentioned in the Message from the Lords of the 23rd day of this instant June) to consider the expediency of making further regulations concerning the admission and practice of Parliamentary Agents, and to report their opinion thereon (*Mr. Raikes*); after short debate, Motion agreed to
Select Committee appointed as follows:—Mr. Bathurst, Mr. Dodson, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Raikes, and Mr. Basil Woodd
l. Message from the Commons that they have appointed a Select Committee of five members to join with the Select Committee appointed by this House
Message to the Commons to propose that the Joint Committee do meet in the Chairman of Committees' Committee Room To-morrow, at Three o'clock *June* 29, 610
Report of the Joint Committee . . . *l.* 152
c. 360
c. Report of the Select Committee considered *July* 24, 1767
Moved, "That this House do agree to the Report of the Select Committee;" after short debate, further consideration adjourned till Friday next
Debate resumed *July* 28, [231] 3; after further short debate, Motion agreed to

Parliamentary Agency
Moved, "That this House, having considered the Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Agency, is of opinion that it is desirable to lay down more definite rules respecting the practice of Parliamentary Agency and the regulation of the conduct of Parliamentary Agents" (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *August* 2, [231] 319
Amendt. to leave out after "That," and add "at this late period of the Session, and without further time for consideration of the Report of the Joint Committee, it is not expedient to delegate the powers of Parliament for the purpose of constituting Parliamentary Agency as a distinct profession" (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn
The Resolutions, 325
l. Resolutions moved (*Lord Redesdale*) [the Resolutions being set forth at length] *August* 11, [231] 1061; Question put thereupon? resolved in the affirmative, and ordered accordingly
Moved that the Chairman of Committees be authorised to enforce all the rules and orders of the House in relation to the conduct of the private business of the House and to the agents and solicitors engaged in prosecuting the same during any prorogation of Parliament (*The Lord President*); on Question, agreed to

Parliamentary and Municipal Elections
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the working of the existing machinery of Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, with power to suggest amendments in the same" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *Feb* 28
And, on Mar 8, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Charles Dilke (Chairman), Mr. Bruen, Mr. Cotes, Mr. Christopher Beckett Denison, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Forster, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Gorst, Lord Francis Hervey, Sir John Holker, Mr. John Holms, Sir Henry James, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Captain Nolan, Mr. Rdiley, Mr. Sheil, Mr. Eustace Smith, Mr. Stewart, and Mr. Villiers
Report of Select Comm. *April* 7 *P.P.* No. 162

Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Boroughs) Bill
(*Mr. Alfred Marten, Mr. Torr, Mr. Birley, Mr. Dodds*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 16 [Bill 108]
Read 2° *June* 13, [229] 1783
Committee *; Report *July* 4 [Bill 229]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 10,
Bill withdrawn * *August* 14 [Bill 294]

Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868
Controverted Elections — Judges' Reports — Durham County (Northern Division) —
227] *Borough of Armagh Feb* 8, 51
Horsham Feb 18, 479; New Writ ordered *Feb* 21

[*cont.*

Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868—cont.
227] *East Suffolk Election*, Question, Mr P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 14, 2009
Registration of Electors — Parochial Relief, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 2, 1205

Parliamentary Electors Registration Bill
(*Mr. Boord, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Grantham*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 25 [Bill 169]
Read 2° * *July* 20
2R. [Dropped]

Parliamentary Franchise — Liverymen (City of London)
Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 6, [228] 1321
Moved, For a Return "Of the number of Liverymen in the City of London entitled to vote at the election of Members of Parliament for the City of London by reason of their patrimony, servitude, or purchase in any of the Companies, arranged in the order of their respective Companies:—Name of Company. Patrimony. Purchase or Redemption. Servitude" (*Mr. James*) *April* 27, 1816; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Return—*P.P.* 454

Parochial Records Bill [H.L.]
(*The Viscount Hutchinson*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 27 (No. 194)
Read 2ª * *July* 31
Committee *; Report *August* 1
Read 3ª * *August* 3
c. Read 1° * *August* 3 [Bill 283]
Read 2° * *August* 7
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3° * *August* 9
l. Royal Assent *August* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 58]

PARNELL, Mr. C. S., *Meath*
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 988
Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 183
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 1397, 1399, 1400
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2073
Criminal Law—Edward O'Meagher Condon, The Convict, [227] 1025
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1494
India—Bombay Native Army, [227] 682
Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1213
Ireland—Constabulary Pensioners, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 572
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 803, 808
Ireland—Peace Preservation Act, Res. Previous Question moved, [228] 1247
Ireland—Protection of Life and Property Act, 1871—Meath, County of, [227] 561
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker), Res. [229] 1441
[*cont.*

PARNELL, Mr. C. S.—*cont.*
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 78; Consid. *cl.* 20, Motion for Adjournment, 1079
Mutiny, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 688
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," [227] 263
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 113
Strangers, Exclusion of—Sessional Order, [229] 1495
Parliament—Referees on Private Bills, Nomination of Select Committee, Amendt. [227] 1497
Peru—"Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [228] 424, 426
Supply, Report, [228] 687

Parrott's Life-Saving Apparatus
Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 31, [231] 120

Partition Act (1868) Amendment Bill
(*Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Alfred Marten*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 73]
Read 2° * *Mar* 7
Committee *; Report *Mar* 8 [Bill 97]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *April* 4
Read 3° * *April* 5
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Selborne*) *April* 6 (No. 52)
Read 2ª * *May* 11
Committee * *May* 22
Report * *May* 23
Read 3ª * *May* 26
Royal Assent *June* 27 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 17]

Patent Laws—Legislation
Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 18, [227] 484

Patents for Inventions Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *Feb* 22, [227] 663 (No. 15)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 14, 1944
Committee * *Mar* 21 (No. 38)
Report * *Mar* 27
Read 3ª * *Mar* 28
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. Attorney General*) *April* 26
Bill withdrawn * *July* 24 [Bill 137]

PATESHALL, Mr. E., *Hereford*
Army—Pension Warrant, The, [230] 256

PEASE, Mr. J. W., *Durham, S.*
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 945
Army Estimates—Land Forces, Amendt. [227] 1264, 1486
City of London Companies, Address for a Return, [229] 1153
Commons, 2R. [227] 533
Criminal Law—Joseph Hadley, Case of, [228] 627
Elementary Education, Comm. [230], 1285; *cl.* 5, 1298; *cl.* 6, 1411; *cl.* 11, Motion for reporting Progress, 1419, 1445
[*cont.*

Pease, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1172
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 837
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 898
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 898; *cl.* 4, 911; *cl.* 6, 1161
Metropolis—Hyde Park—Rotten Row, State of, [227] 1206;—Serpentine, 1714, 1715
Metropolis — Hyde Park—Serpentine, [228] 479; Res. 1247, 1250, 1815
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, [228] 1100
Prisons, 2R. [230] 314, 897
Royal Titles, 2R. [227] 1759; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [228] 309, 315, 329; 3R. 480, 482
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 425
Supply—Fishery Board (Scotland), [227] 992
Report, [227] 995
Vaccination Acts—Milner's Case, [228] 477
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1137

Peek, Sir H. W., *Surrey, Mid*
Inland Revenue—Servants, Taxes on Casual, [227] 400
Post Office—House of Commons, [230] 1395
Post Office Telegraphs—Safety of Wires (Metropolis), [228] 69
Toll Bridges (River Thames), [230] 1624
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1143

Peel, Right Hon. Sir R., *Tamworth*
Navy—"Mistletoe" Collision, [228] 1477
Parliament—Order—Private Bills—Solicitation of Votes, Explanation, [230] 864, 865
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 441

Peel, Mr. A. W., *Warwick Bo.*
Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 450
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [227] 437, 438; Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 908; *cl.* 5, 1155; *cl.* 18, 1809; *add. cl.* [229] 58, 93, 214
Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 991

Pell, Mr. A., *Leicestershire, S.*
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1382
Commons, 2R. [227] 534; Comm. *cl.* 8, [229] 1530
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2063
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 734
229] Elementary Education, Leave, 961; 2R. 1945
230] Comm. *cl.* 5, 1298; *cl.* 14, 1456; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 1501; *add. cl.* 1536, 1666, 1670, 1829, 1891, 1897, 1902, 1991
231] Consid. *cl.* 8, 475; *cl.* 14, 484, 490; Consid. *cl.* 14, 527
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1281
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 870

[*cont.*

Pell, Mr. A.—*cont.*
Local Taxation, [227] 1123;—Amount and Distribution, [229] 669
Poor Law—Charlotte Hammond, Case of, [230] 950;—Out-door Relief, [229] 1425
Poor Law—(Out-Door) Relief, Res. [230] 1551
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, Amendt. [229] 1765, 1771; *add. cl.* 1775, 1776, 1779; Consid. Amendt. [230] 503
Prisons, Leave, [229] 1548
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1140

Pemberton, Mr. E. L., *Kent, E.*
Oyster Fishery—Herne Bay, [228] 266; [231] 8
Public Health—Sheerness Sewers, [231] 416
Queenborough Harbour, 3R. [229] 1966
Unreformed Municipal Corporations (England and Wales), Res. [227] 1158

Pender, Mr. J., *Wick, &c.*
China—Blockade Question, [230] 503
Kiung Chow, Port of, [229] 671
Corea—Proposed Treaty, [229] 1039

Pensions Commutation Acts Amendment Bill (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Secretary Hardy, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Resolution [June 30] reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered* *July* 3
Read 1°* *July* 4 [Bill 230]
Read 2°* *July* 6
Committee*; Report; read 3° *August* 12
l. Read 1ª* (*Marquess of Salisbury*) *August* 12
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *August* 14 (No. 236)
Royal Assent *August* 14 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 73]

Percy, Right Hon. Earl, *Northumberland, N.*
Army—Militia Adjutants, [227] 1770
Commons, Comm. [229] 1252
Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, Res. [228] 1249
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 994
Parliament—Order—Debates in the House of Lords, Reference to, [229] 1622, 1623
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1844
Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 376

Perkins, Sir F., *Southampton*
Navy—Good Conduct Badges, [230] 1044, 1045
Ordnance Survey—Superannuation, [228] 1481

Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill
(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Sir Thomas Bazley, Mr. Downing, Mr. Richard, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Dalway, Mr. William Johnston*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 19]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 14, [229] 1821

[*cont.*

Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill—cont.
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Wheelhouse*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 81, N. 299; M. 218
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off

Peru—Guano
Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 17, [227] 406

Peru—Case of the "Talisman"
Amendt. on Vote in Supply, £163,163, to complete sum for Diplomatic Services
Amendt. moved to reduce the Vote by £2,000, Salary of the British Minister in Peru (*Dr. Cameron*)
Moved to leave out "£163,163," and insert "£161,163" (*Dr. Cameron*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That '£163,163' stand part, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Vote agreed to *August* 7, [231] 746

Peru—Crew of the Steamship "Talisman"
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the circumstances connected with the seizure of the British Steamship 'Talisman' by the Peruvian Government, her employment in the national service of Peru, the impressment of her crew on board Peruvian war ships, their prolonged imprisonment without trial, and the whole circumstances of the trial" (*Dr. Cameron*) *Mar* 21, [228] 375; after long debate, Debate adjourned
Order read, and discharged *May* 29
Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 27, [228] 622; Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 7, 1406; Questions, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Bourke *April* 25, 1634; *May* 2, 1985
Further Correspondence *P.P.* [1419, 1592]

PETERBOROUGH, Bishop of
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 117
Intemperance, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 723

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (Aldborough, &c.) Bill
(*Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Edward Stanhope*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *April* 24 [Bill 131]
Read 2°* *April* 27
Committee*; Report *May* 5
Read 3°* *May* 8
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Elphinstone*) *May* 9 (No. 78)
Read 2ª* *May* 18
Committee* *May* 22
Report* *May* 23
Read 3ª* *May* 26
Royal Assent *June* 27 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 40]

PIM, Captain B., *Gravesend*
Administration of the Navy, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 432, 437, 440
Church of England—Episcopal See of Gibraltar, [231] 1156
Heligoland, [229] 1972
Henwood, Mr. C., Petition of, Res. [227] 1405; [228] 343
Mercantile Marine—Miscellaneous Questions
  Burglaries at Sea, [228] 1135
  Horatio Walters, Case of, [231] 1206
  Merchant Seamen Deserters, [228] 1909
  Training Ship Schools, [227] 816
Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1837
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [228] 899; *add. cl.* [229] 61, 62, 233; Consid. *add. cl.* 1055, 1056, 1058, 1059; Lords Amendts. Consid. [231] 1168, 1175
Merchant Shipping Act, 1854—Surgeons, [229] 105; [230] 1963
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  Anchors and Cables (The "Victoria and Albert"), [228] 562
  Arctic Expedition, [227] 401;—Admiralty Instructions, [230] 422
  Condemned Ships, [228] 268
  Designs of Ships of War, [231] 1157
  H.M.S. "Thunderer," [230] 1887
  H.M.S. "Vanguard"—The Return, [230] 337, 338, 1478; [231] 1156
  Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, [229] 774
  Royal Naval Reserve, [230] 1964
  Royal Yacht, [228] 964
  Screw Propellers, [227] 1865
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, Amendt. [227] 1074, 1869; [231] 1076
Parliament—Public Business, [229] 1666
Thames Valley Drainage—Report of Colonel Cox, [228] 1484

PLAYFAIR, Right Hon. Mr. Lyon, *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*
Army—Medical Officers, [227] 1799
  Militia Surgeons — Compensation, [231] 697
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [231] 921; Consid. *cl.* 3, 1149; *add. cl.* 1152
Education Code — Subjects, Choice of, Res. [227] 1811
Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 957; 3R. 1931; Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1409; *cl.* 14, 1455; *add. cl.* 1541, 1647, 1672, 1861, 1867, 1910; *add. cl.* [231] 10, 15; Consid. *cl.* 14, 480, 494, 534, 548; *cl.* 16, 555
India—Indian Civil Service, [228] 473;—Regulations, [227] 1202
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1012
Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1877; Consid. Amendt. [231] 281; Amendt. 318
Post Office — Postal Telegraph Department, Res. [228] 221
Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker), Res. [229] 1441
Scientific Instruction, Royal Commission on, [227] 551
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 1102
  Fishery Board, Scotland, [227] 993
University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1068

Plimsoll, Mr. S., *Derby Bo.*
Mercantile Marine—Unseaworthy Ships, [227] 407
227] Merchant Shipping, Leave, 180; 2R. 438, 441
228] Comm. *cl.* 3, 550; Amendt. 627; Amendt. 638, 643, 668, 687, 899, 908, 909; *cl.* 4, 911; *cl.* 5, 1151; Amendt. 1156, 1157, 1158; *cl.* 6, 1161; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1371; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1374, 1375, 1377; Amendt. 1580, 1584; Amendt. 1585; Amendt. 1587, 1588; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1590, 1595, 1597, 1610, 1620; *cl.* 16, 1791, 1803; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1804; *cl.* 18, Amendt. *ib.*; Amendt. 1806, 1808; *cl.* 26, 1914; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 1916, 1918; *add. cl.* 1924, 1925; Amendt. 1938; Amendt. 1940, 1941
229] 54, 56, 62, 64, 65, 67, 69, 74, 208, 216, 218, 227, 228, 229, 232; Consid. *add. cl.* 1063; *cl.* 11, 1069; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1071, 1073; Amendt. 1075; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1077; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 1080
231] Lords Amendts. Consid. 1173, 1178; Amendt. 1182, 1183; Consequential Amendt. 1222
Merchant Shipping Acts—Grain Cargoes, [229] 1519; —"Skerryvore," The, [230] 244
Navy—Condemned Provisions—The Return, [229] 1519
Meat, [230] 244

Plumstead and Wormholt Commons
Moved, "That the [Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)] Bill be now read 2°" *August* 8, [231] 821
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the action of the War Office with reference to Plumstead Common, in the county of Kent, and Wormholt Common, in the manor of Fulham, is such as to imperil the use of those open spaces for recreation by the people of the metropolis" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to

Plunket, Hon. D. R. (Solicitor General for Ireland), *Dublin University*
Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland), 2R. [228] 1885
Chairmen's Jurisdiction (Ireland), Leave, [231] 664
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Leave, [227] 544, 1124; 2R. [230] 535
Clerk of the Peace and of the Crown (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1337
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, Res. [229] 1287
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1902
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 874
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Clerks of the Peace, [230] 852
Criminal Law—Claffey, Trial of, [231] 975
Irish Church—Sale of Ecclesiastical Edifices, [230] 1973
Landed Estates Court—Second Judge, Appointment of, [228] 70
Law and Justice — Irish Ante-Union Statutes, [227] 2015; [228] 1912
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [228] 743

[*cont.*

Plunket, Hon. D. R.—*cont.*
Ireland—Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 312
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker), Res. [229] 1442
Juries (Dublin), Leave, [231] 664, 665
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 664, 666, 707
Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 29
Supply — Revenue Departments, &c. [228] 1878
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. [229] 1754; Comm. [230] 346, 363, 365

Plunkett, Hon. R. E., *Gloucester, W.*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 733

Police (Expenses) Act Continuance Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 24 [Bill 268]
Read 2°* *July* 28
Committee*; Report *July* 31
Read 3°* *August* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *August* 8
Read 2ª* *August* 10 (No. 212)
Committee*; Report *August* 11
Read 3ª* *August* 12
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 64]

Police Superannuation
Report of the Special Committee, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 24, [227] 814
Re-appointment of the Committee, Question, General Shute; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 24, [228] 562

Pollution of Rivers Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) *June* 8, [229] 1599; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 186]
2R., debate adjourned *June* 22
Question, Mr. Ripley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-
230] Booth *July* 11, 1282
Order for Adjourned Debate read; Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 20, 1675
Moved, "That the Debate be further adjourned" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); after short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate further adjourned
Adjourned Debate resumed *July* 24, 1876; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Motion withdrawn
Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *July* 25 [Bill 272]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 28 [Bill 276]
Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Con-
231] sideration" *August* 1, 281
After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered
Amendt. in page 3, line 13, to leave out "at a reasonable cost" (*Mr. Lyon Playfair*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned

[*cont.*

Pollution of Rivers Bill—cont.

231] Debate resumed *August* 1, 318; Question put, and agreed to; Amendts. made
Read 3° * *August* 4
Lords Amendts. [Bill 297]
l. Read 1ª * (*M. of Salisbury*) *August* 7 (No. 207)
. Read 2ª *August* 8, 814
Committee * *August* 10
Report * *August* 11 (No. 227)
Read 3ª * *August* 12
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 75]

Poolbeg Lighthouse Bill

(*Mr. Edward Stanhope, Sir Charles Adderley*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 13 [Bill 105]
Read 2° * *Mar* 24
Order for Committee read, and discharged; Bill committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 27
Ordered, That the Select Committee on the Poolbeg Lighthouse Bill do consist of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two to be nominated by the Committee of Selection *Mar* 28
Ordered, That all Petitions presented against the Bill be referred to the Select Committee on the Bill, provided such Petitions are presented two clear days before the meeting of the Committee, and that such of the Petitioners as pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents, be heard upon their Petitions, if they think fit, and Counsel heard in favour of the Bill against the said Petitions:—That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum (*Sir Charles Adderley*)
And, on *April* 7, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild (Chairman), Mr. Dalrymple, nominated by Committee of Selection; Mr. Balfour, Mr. Meldon, and Sir Henry Wilmot
Report of Select Comm. *May* 2
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 4
Read 3° * *May* 8 [Bill 140]
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Elphinstone*) *May* 9 (No. 79)
Read 2ª * *May* 18
Committee *; Report *May* 22
Read 3ª * *May* 23
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict.* c. 18]

Poor Law

Miscellaneous Questions

Bath Board of Guardians, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 1, [231] 254
Deportation of Female Paupers, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 29, [230] 613
Ireland—South Dublin Workhouse, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 24, [230] 1812
Metropolis — Case of Charlotte Hammond, Question, Mr. Watney; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 29, [229] 1351; Question, Mr. Pell; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 4, [230] 950; Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 20, 1628
Papers . . . . *Parl. P.* 377

[*cont.*

Poor Law—cont.

Out-door Relief, Question, Mr. Dundas; Answer, Mr. Salt *Mar* 30, [228] 876; Question, Mr. Brown; Answer, Mr. Pell *May* 30, [229] 1425; Resolution, Mr. Pell *July* 18, [230] 1551 [House counted out]
Workhouse Sunday Services (*Oldham*), Question, Sir Thomas Bazley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 27, [228] 625

Poor Law Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 17 [Bill 78]
228] Read 2° *Mar* 24, 594
. Committee—R.P. *April* 7, 1469
229] Committee—R.P. *June* 8, 1595
. Committee; Report *June* 13, 1764 [Bill 190]
230] Considered *June* 26, 477; after debate, Debate adjourned
Considered *June* 27, 503
Read 3° * *June* 28
Lords Amendts. [Bill 282]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) *June* 29 (No. 150)
. Read 2ª, after short debate *July* 11, 1273
. Committee, after debate *July* 17, 1471 (No. 181)
Report * *July* 20 (No. 185)
Read 3ª * *July* 21
Commons Amendts. (No. 209)
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 61]

Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. Callan, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Downing*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 25 [Bill 88]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 20

Poor Law Rating (Ireland) Bill

(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 18 [Bill 156]
Read 2°, after short debate *June* 16, [229] 2024
Committee *; Report *July* 24
Considered * *July* 27
Read 3° * *July* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *July* 31 (No. 197)
Read 2ª *August* 4, [231] 499
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Read 3ª * *August* 8
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 50]

Poor Law (Scotland) Bill

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)

c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *April* 10, [228] 1554; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 130]
Read 2°, after debate *May* 8, [229] 258
Committee *; Report *June* 1 [Bill 179]
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 27, [230] 504

[*cont.*

Poor Law (*Scotland*)—cont.
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Baxter*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. D. Cameron*); Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 6, 1049
Bill withdrawn * *July* 24

PORTMAN, Viscount
Agricultural Holdings (England) Act (1875), Motion for a Return, [230] 3

Ports, Harbours, &c., United Kingdom
Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *August* 7, [231] 699

PORTSMOUTH, Earl of
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 118; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 126, 127

Portugal, Commercial Relations with
Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 10, [227] 137; Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 16, [228] 67

POST OFFICE
Twenty-first Report of Postmaster General . . . . *P.P.* [1575]
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
American Transatlantic Mails, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 20, [228] 268
North American Mail Contracts, Questions, Mr. Baxter; Answers, Lord John Manners *Feb* 14, [227] 258; *Mar* 16, [228] 63; *July* 13, [230] 1392
Cape of Good Hope Mail Contract, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 10, [230] 1173
Channel Islands, The—Alderney, Question, Mr. Alderman M‘Arthur; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 6, [228] 1323
Dover Pier—English and Foreign Mail Boats, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 25, [230] 1885
Female Clerks in the Savings Bank Department, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 4, [228] 1179
Glasgow Post Office, The, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 28, [228] 1832
House of Commons Post Office, Question, Sir Henry Peek; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 13, [230] 1395
Letter Carriers' Uniform, Question, Mr. Earp; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 22, [230] 245
Mail Routes in Ireland, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 11, [227] 227
Mails to the Hebrides, Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 13, [227] 1868

[*cont.*

POST OFFICE—*cont.*
Parliamentary Papers and Blue Books, Questions, Mr. M‘Laren; Answers, Lord John Manners, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 6, [228] 1324; *April* 7, 1408
Postage Rates to India, Question, Mr. Leith; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 21, [228] 351
Postal Rates to India, West Indies, and Australia, Question, Mr. Hankey; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 15, [227] 303
Post Office Cheques, Question, Mr. Neville-Grenville; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 14, [227] 258
Post Office Savings Banks, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 12, [229] 1665
Post Office Savings Bank Department—Site, Question, Mr. Redmond; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 13, [227] 1866
Rural Post Office Messengers (*Ireland*), Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 4, [228] 1180
22nd Report *P.P.* . . . . . . [1575]
Postal Convention, Belgium . . [1423]
Postal Convention, Spain . . . [1451]
Postal Union (India) . . . . . [1554]
West India Home Mails, Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 24, [230] 819

Post Office Telegraph Department
Glengarriffe, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 4, [228] 1180
International Law — Submarine Telegraphs, Question, Mr. E. Noel; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 23, [228] 476
Postal Telegraph Service — The Provincial Staff, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 2, [227] 1207;—*The Royal Engineers*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 9, 1710
Provincial Continental Messages, Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 30, [230] 736
Safety of Wires (*Metropolis*), Question, Sir Henry Peek; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 16, [228] 69; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 24, 1579
Special Wires—The Newspaper Press, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 8, [231] 815
Telegraph Cards, Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Lord John Manners *Feb* 10, [227] 137; *Mar* 6, 1413
Telegraph Messages—Galway Races, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 11, [231] 1068
Telegraph Stamps, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 17, [227] 404
Telegraph System (*Scotland*), Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 22, [229] 1053
Telegraphic Communication in Cornwall, Question, Mr. Young; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 31, [231] 113
Telegraphic Communication with South Africa, Question, Mr. A. M‘Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 15, [229] 672

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

- *Telegraphs in Small Towns,* Question, Mr. David Jenkins; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 28, [228] 1833
- *Telegraphs—Orkney and the Shetland Islands,* Question, Mr. Laing; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 30, [229] 1418

Post Office Telegraph Services [*Loan*]

- Considered in Committee; Moved to resolve, "That it is expedient to authorize the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to raise further sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of Five Hundred Thousand Pounds, for the purposes of the Telegraph Acts, by the creation of Three per cent. Capital Stocks of Annuities chargeable on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom" (*Mr. W. H. Smith*) *Feb* 28, [227] 1103; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Post Office—The Telegraph Department

- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 17, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the organization and management of the Telegraph Department of the Post Office" (*Mr. Goldsmid*) *v.*, [228] 172; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
- Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the organization and financial system of the Telegraph Department of the Post Office" (*Mr. Goldsmid*)
- And, on Mar 31, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Lyon Playfair (Chairman), Colonel Alexander, Mr. Charles Allsopp, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Cubitt, Mr. William Beckett Denison, Mr. Fielden, Mr. Goldsmid, Mr. Leveson Gower, Mr. John Holms, Mr. Meldon, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Ripley, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Watney, and Mr. Watkin Williams
  - Report of Select Comm. *July* 13 *P.P.* 357

Potter, Mr. T. B., *Rochdale*

- Italy, Commercial Treaty with—Malta, [229] 367
- Malta, Taxation in, Res. [229] 1976
- Navy—H.M.S. "Monarch" and "Raleigh," [231] 1202
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [230] 574, 606
- Royal Titles Proclamation, [228] 1768

Power, Mr. J. O'Connor, *Mayo*

- Aliens' Order in Council, 1873—Gibraltar, [228] 1831, 1832; [230] 1434
- Criminal Law—Fenian Prisoners, The Escaped, [230] 251
- Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1044, 1050
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Magistrates—Orange Meeting, Speech at, [229] 171
  - Police—Mayo, Extra Force in, [228] 1830
  - Registry of Deeds Office, [230] 418

Power, Mr. J. O'Connor—*cont.*

- Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [228] 725
- Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 767, 808
- Ireland—Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 285, 318
- Ireland—Peace Preservation, Res. [228] 1240, 1241
- Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 270
- Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 686
- Parliament—Public Petition from a Foreign Town — Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1418
- Peru—Steamship "Talisman," Crew of the, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 424
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 364

Power, Mr. R., *Waterford*

- Ireland—Kilbarry Marsh, [230] 5
  - Lunatic Asylums, [229] 1193
- Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 786
- Merchant Shipping—Lighthouse on Coningbeg Rock, [229] 1352
- Parliament—Derby Day, [229] 1433

Powerscourt, Viscount

- Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [229] 915

Powis, Earl of

- Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 15, [227] 1290
- Cattle Diseases (England and Ireland)—Privy Council Regulations, [227] 130
- Commons, Comm. *cl.* 21, [230] 1431
- Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [227] 1198
- Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, Traffic at, [227] 549
- National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, [229] 362
- Poor Law Amendment, 2R. [230] 1277

Prevention of Crimes Act Amendment Bill

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)

- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *May* 18 [Bill 153]
  - Read 2°, after short debate *June* 8, [229] 1596
  - Committee*; Report *June* 15
  - Read 3°* *June* 16
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Steward*) *June* 19 (No. 125)
  - Read 2ª, after short debate *June* 27, [230] 485
  - Committee*; Report *June* 29
  - Read 3ª* *June* 30
  - Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 23]

Price, Captain G. E., *Devonport*

- Iron-clad Navies, British and Foreign, [227] 1916
- Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Royal Marines, [228] 1524;—Officers of—Retirement, [229] 2012
  - Royal Naval Engineers, Committee on, [229] 1193
  - Torpedoes—Captain Harvey, [228] 563
  - Widows of Seamen and Marines, [227] 482

PRICE, Captain G. E.—*cont.*
Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. [230] 169
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1082
Navy—Navigation of Her Majesty's Ships, Res. Amendt. [228] 1650
Navy Estimates—Coastguard Services, [229] 257
· Men and Boys, [227] 1941
Newfoundland Fisheries, [227] 676; [228] 1177;—French Shore, [229] 667
Royal Titles Act—Commissions in the Militia, [229] 106
Sierra Leone—Financial Position, [229] 1039
Slave Trade—Sultan of Zanzibar, Treaty with the, [229] 1117
Slave Trade (East Africa), Res. [228] 1228

PRICE, Mr. W. E., *Tewkesbury*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Militia Quartermasters — Pensions, [227] 1235
Mobilization of Army Corps, [228] 69
Retired Officers, [230] 245
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 952
Education—Canal Population, [230] 859

Prisons Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Orders of the Day postponed (*Mr. Disraeli*) Motion for Leave (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *June* 1,
229] 1536; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 180]
230] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 22, 274
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House, whilst recognizing the necessity of measures being adopted to secure economy and efficiency in the management of Prisons, is of opinion that it would be inexpedient to transfer the control and management of Prisons from Local Authorities to the Secretary of State" (*Mr. Rylands*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Alderman Cotton*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
. *Prison Chaplains*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 30, 737
. Adjourned Debate resumed *July* 3, 885; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Thomas Chambers*); Question put; A. 122, N. 298; M. 176
Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*); Motion withdrawn; Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 295, N. 96; M. 199
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
. *Roman Catholic Chaplains*, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 13, 1394
Committee *; Report *August* 4 [Bill 284]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 9

Prisons (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 15 [Bill 197]
Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 27, [230] 1964
Bill withdrawn * *August* 7

Prisons (Ireland)—Legislation
Question, Mr. Redmond; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 14, [227] 264

Prisons (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *July* 13, [230] 1421; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered
Read 1° * *July* 14 [Bill 247]
Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 7, [231] 704
Bill withdrawn * *August* 7

Privy Council—Oaths taken by Members, &c.)—Mr. Lowe's Speech at Retford
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Returns of the form of the Oath or Oaths taken by persons sworn Members of the Privy Council: And, showing the respective dates when the following persons were sworn in as Members of the Privy Council:—The late Edward Geoffrey Smith-Stanley Earl of Derby, the late Viscount Palmerston, the Right honourable John Earl Russell, the Right honourable Member for Bucks, the Right honourable Member for Greenwich, and the Right honourable Member for the University of London" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*) *May* 2, [228] 2023; after debate, Question put; A. 91, N. 37; M. 54
Personal Statement, Mr. Lowe *May* 4, [229] 52 *P.P.* 223

Protection to Growing Crops (Scotland) Bill (*Sir Alexander Gordon, Sir Robert Anstruther, Viscount Macduff, Sir Windham Anstruther*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 2 [Bill 95]
2R., debate adjourned *July* 5, [230] 1028
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

Provisional Orders (Ireland) Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 2 (No. 67)
Read 2ª * *May* 18
Committee * *June* 23
Report * *June* 26
Read 3ª * *June* 27
c. Read 1° * (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *July* 3
Read 2° * *July* 6 [Bill 220]
Committee *; Report *July* 17
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clv]

Provisional Orders (Ireland) Confirmation (Coleraine, &c.) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 13 (No. 107)
Read 2ª* *June* 20
Committee* *June* 29
Report* *June* 30
Read 3ª* *July* 3
c. Read 1°* (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *July* 6
Read 2°* *July* 10 [Bill 240]
Committee*; Report *July* 18
Read 3°* *July* 20
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clxii]

Publicans Certificates (Scotland) Bill
(*Dr. Cameron, Sir Windham Anstruther, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Mackintosh*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 45]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 15, [227] 328
Committee*; Report *Mar* 28
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *April* 27, [228] 1809
Considered* *April* 28 [Bill 115]
Read 3°* *May* 1
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl Stanhope*) *May* 2 (No. 66)
Read 2ª, after short debate *May* 12, [229] 481
Committee *June* 20, [230] 102 (No. 130)
Report* *June* 26 (No. 143)
Read 3ª* *June* 27
Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 26]

Public Health
Drainage and Water Supply of Uppingham—Return of the School, Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 14, [231] 1206
Impure and Deficient Supply of Water, Question, Mr. Brown; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 28, [231] 6
Medical Officer to the Privy Council, Questions, Mr. Waddy; Answers, Viscount Sandon, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 1, [229] 1517
Public Health Act, 1872—*Medical Officers of Health*, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 3, [231] 419
Public Health Act, 1875—*Local Board Elections*, Question, Sir John Kennaway; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 31, [228] 969
Quack Medicines, Question, Colonel Egerton Leigh; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 20, [228] 269
Solihull Sanitary Authority, Question, Sir Henry Jackson; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 16, [229] 1973
The Sheerness Sewers, Question, Mr. Pemberton; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 3, [231] 416
Typhoid Fever at Eagley — Polluted Milk, Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 21, [227] 552; Question, Mr. J. K. Cross; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 10, [228] 1474; Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 3, [231] 421
Supervision of Dairy Farms, Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 14, [231] 1199

[*cont.*

Public Health—cont.
Vaccination Acts
Arrests, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 22, [229] 1052
Boards of Guardians, Question, Sir Charles Forster; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 4, [230] 945;—*The Keighley Board of Guardians*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 7, [230] 1139
Case of Joseph Abel, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 12, [231] 1155
Case of Mr. Pearce, Questions, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 25, [230] 1883; *August* 8, [231] 819
Milner's Case, Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 23, [228] 477
Prosecutions, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 16, [228] 62 [See title *Hygienic*]

Public Health (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 30 [Bill 178]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 24

Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (Irvine and Dundonald) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Steward*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 15 (No. 118)
Read 2ª* *June* 20
Committee* *June* 29
Report* *June* 30
Read 3ª* *July* 3
c. Read 1°* (*The Lord Advocate*) *July* 6 [Bill 237]
Read 2°* *July* 10
Committee*; Report *July* 18
Read 3°* *July* 20
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. clix]

Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (Wemyss) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered* *May* 23
Read 1°* *May* 24 [Bill 165]
Read 2°* *May* 26
Committee*; Report *June* 8
Read 3°* *June* 9
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Steward*) *June* 13 (No. 109)
Read 2ª* *June* 22
Committee* *June* 26
Report* *June* 27
Read 3ª* *June* 29
Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 94]

Public Meetings—Freedom of Discussion
Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 6, [228] 1327

Public Record Office Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 20 [Bill 262]
Read 2°* *July* 24
Bill withdrawn* *August* 10

Public Records (Ireland) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Gibson, The Marquess of Hamilton, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Mulholland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 3 [Bill 141]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 27

Public Schools Act, 1868
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 7, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to consider whether any alteration is desirable in the existing relations between the Governing Bodies, Head Masters, and Assistant Masters of the seven schools under the operation of 'The Public Schools Act, 1868'" (*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*) *v.*, [228] 1420 ; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to

Public Works Loans Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Local Finance—Indebtedness of Local Authorities, Question, Mr. Rathbone ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 29, [229] 1353
Resolutions [June 19] reported, and agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1° * *June* 20 [Bill 202]
Read 2° * *June* 27
Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 4, [230] 951
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, an unduly large proportion of the charge involved in the payment of the interest and capital of the loans which are raised by local authorities falls upon the occupiers, as distinguished from the owners, of land, houses, and other rateable property" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to ; Committee ; Report
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 6
Considered * *July* 7 [Bill 228]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report ; Considered ; read 3° *July* 10
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 11 (No. 167)
Read 2ª * *July* 14
Committee * ; Report *July* 17
Read 3ª * *July* 18
Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 31]

PULESTON, Mr. J. H., *Devonport*
China—Hankow, Outrage at, [229] 44
Navy—Engineer Service, [229] 44
United States — Winslow Extradition Case, [229] 45

Queen Anne's Bounty Bill [H.L.]—See title **Agricultural Holdings (England) Act (1875) Amendment Bill**

Queenborough Harbour Bill (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Pemberton*) *June* 16, [229] 1966
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "having regard to the fact that a Royal Commission has lately been appointed to investigate the affairs of Unreformed Corporations, it is not desirable to proceed with a Bill conferring fresh borrowing and taxing powers upon a Corporation which has been bankrupt under circumstances disclosed in a Memorial ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 30th July 1875" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Question put ; A. 143, N. 84 ; M. 59
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 3°

Queen's Visit to Germany
Questions, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Sullivan ; Answers Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 28, [228] 700 ; Questions, Mr. Anderson ; Answers, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 30, 882

RAIKES, Mr. H. C. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means), *Chester*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 1, [230] 1159 ; Consid. [231] 860
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1277
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 717
Burghs and Populous Places (Scotland) Gas Supply, 2R. [228] 5 ; Amendt. 7 ; Comm. [229] 998
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1375
Cattle Disease (Ireland), Comm. [230] 1677
Commons, Comm. [229] 1380 ; *cl.* 2, 1399, 1400
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Consid. *cl.* 1, [231] 978
Edinburgh Improvement, 2R. [230] 241
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1285 ; *cl.* 6, 1400 ; *cl.* 11, 1447 ; *add. cl.* 1652, 1658, 1659, 1850, 1904, 2003, 2004 ; *add. cl.* [231] 20
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 1624
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 269
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 638, 639, 687, 906 ; *cl.* 15, 1590 ; *cl.* 16, 1791, 1792 ; *cl.* 27, 1916, 1918 ; *add. cl.* [229] 78, 91, 219, 229, 235
Metropolitan Railway, 2R. [227] 809
Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5, Consid. [231] 660
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. [227] 1942
Parliament—Private Bills—Canvassing in the House, Res. [227] 1494
Parliament—Private Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 495 ;—Instruction, Res. [228] 616
Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 319, 330
Parliamentary Agents—Lords Message, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 573
Queenborough Harbour, 3R. [229] 1969
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [231] 434
South Eastern Railway, 2R. [227] 1705, 1706 ; [228] 61
University of Cambridge, 2R. [230] 1110

[*cont.*

Railway Companies—Dismissal of Servants

Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 23, [230] 336

Railway Passenger Duty

Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 28, [227] 1020

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Railway Passenger Duty ought to be reduced at an early date, with a view to its ultimate repeal" (*Mr. Serjeant Spinks*) *Mar* 7, [227] 1586

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the operation of the present Law relating to the Railway Passenger Duty, and especially as to its effect upon the working of cheap trains" (*Mr. Rodwell*) *v.*; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and negatived

Question proposed, "That the words 'a Select Committee, &c.' be added, instead thereof"

Amendt. to said proposed Amendt. to add "and further to inquire what additional accommodation for the public may fairly be demanded from the Railway Companies as an equivalent for a reduction or the abolition of the Duty" (*Mr. Fawcett*); Question put, "That those words, &c.;" A. 41, N. 113; M. 72

Question put, "That the words 'a Select Committee, &c.' be added to 'That' in the original Question;" A. 137, N. 23; M. 144

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Select Committee appointed

And, on *Mar* 23, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Rodwell (Chairman), Mr. Ashley, Mr. Bruce, Mr. James Corry, Viscount Crichton, Lord Claud Hamilton, Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Leighton, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Arthur Peel, Earl Percy, Mr. Samuda, Mr. Serjeant Spinks, Mr. Edward Stanhope, and Mr. Sullivan

Report of Select Comm. *June* 23 *P.P.* 312

Railways

Accident on the Great Western Railway, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 28, [231] 8; Question, Mr. Goldney; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *August* 4, 516;—*Reward to John Chiddy*, Observations, Lord Elcho; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 7, [231] 712

Midland Railway—The Radstock Accident—The Block System, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *August* 11, [231] 1078

Commission on Railway Accidents

Brakes, Question, Observations, Lord Colville of Culross; Reply, The Earl of Aberdeen; short debate thereon *May* 23, [229] 1095

Case of Frederick Harcombe, Question, Mr. M. A. Bass; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 1, [229] 1518

[*cont.*

Railways—cont.

The Report, Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, 227] Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 15, 301; Question, Mr. Elliot; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Feb* 21, 551; Question, Observations, Lord Cottesloe; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Feb* 22, 664; Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 25, 928

Second Report . . . . [1474]

Ralli, Mr. P., *Bridport*

Commons, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1567

Egypt—Court of Summary Justice, [230] 1698

Ramsay, Mr. J., *Falkirk, &c.*

Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 1126

Banns of Marriage (Scotland), 2R. [230] 211

Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1923

Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 28

Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 456

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland), 2R. [228] 1162

Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1663

Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1725, 2017; [231] 21, 63; Consid. *cl.* 14, 525; Amendt. 547, 549

Explosive Substances Act, 1875—Hamilton, Explosion at, [230] 258

Game Laws Amendment, 2R. [228] 1816

Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1641

Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5, Comm. [231] 658

Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [229] 2021

Parliament—Business of the Session, [231] 124

Public Business, [229] 2018

Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 259, 260

Private Lunatic Asylums (Scotland), [230] 1134

Sheriff Courts (Scotland), 2R. [231] 564

Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1333

Civil Service Commission, [227] 513

Home and Colonial Offices, [229] 1588

Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [231] 655

Local Government Board, &c. [227] 520

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [227] 1841

Lunacy Commission (Scotland), [227] 994

Public Buildings, [229] 1584, 1585

Public Education in Scotland, [231] 267

Report, [228] 687

Rathbone, Mr. W., *Liverpool*

County Palatine of Lancaster (Clerk of the Peace), 2R. Amendt. [227] 336; Comm. Amendt. 1160, 1161

Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 8, [230] 1530; *add. cl.* 1538, 2007; *add. cl.* [231] 9

Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 903

Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) (No. 2), 2R. [228] 1889

Local Finance—Indebtedness of Local Authorities, [229] 1353

[*cont.*

RATHBONE, Mr. W.—*cont:*
Local Taxation, [229] 1185
Mercantile Marine — Shipwrecked Vessels, [229] 1190
227] Merchant Shipping, 2R. 428
228] Comm. 537 ; *cl.* 3, 549, 676, 905 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 910 ; Amendt. 911, 912 ; *cl.* 6, 1368 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1372, 1373 ; *cl.* 15, 1592, 1614, 1618, 1621 ; *cl.* 16, 1801, 1803 ; *cl.* 19, 1882 ; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1883 ; *add. cl.* 1932
229] *add. cl.* 56, 63, 93, 209, 222, 233 ; Consid. *add cl.* 1062 ; *cl.* 11, 1068, 1070, 1071
Municipal Officers Superannuation (No. 2), 2R. [227] 322 ; Comm. 1603
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1766 ; Amendt. 1771
Prisons, Leave, [229] 1552
Public Works Loans, Comm. [230] 963

Rating Act, 1874—*St. Thomas's Hospital*
Question, Sir John Scourfield ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 10, [228] 1475

RAYLEIGH, Lord
Cruelty to Animals, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [230] 109, 120

READ, Mr. Clare S., *Norfolk, S.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2017, 2073
Coroners, Res. [230] 1308
229] Elementary Education, Leave, 956
230] 2R. 54 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1290, 1292 ; *cl.* 5, 1298 ; *cl.* 7, 1417 ; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 1418, 1420, 1444 ; Amendt. 1447 ; *cl.* 29, 1510 ; *cl.* 34, 1513 ; *add. cl.* 1902
231] Consid. *cl.* 5, Amendt. 473, 474 ; *cl.* 8, 475 ; *cl.* 14, 477, 529 ; 3R. 585, 595
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1636
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 15, [228] 1603
Navy—Boilers, Deterioration of, [231] 968
Dockyards, Superintendents of, [231] 967
Pollution of Rivers, 3R. [231] 560
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1768 ; Consid. [230] 504
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1360

Real Estate Intestacy Bill
(*Mr. Potter, Mr. Leatham, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. William Edwin Price*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 31]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 28, [230] 574
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Gregory*) ; after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 175, N. 210 ; M. 35
Division List, A. and N. 606
Words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to ; 2R. put off for six months

Record Office, The—Destruction and Sale of Public Records
Question, Mr. W. Gordon ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 7, [231] 692

REDESDALE, Lord (Chairman of Committees)
Appeals—Standing Orders, Res. [227] 1200
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [227] 1286 ; 3R. 1946 ; Commons Amendts. Consid. *cl.* 5, [231] 947
Commons, 2R. [230] 1037 ; Report, *cl.* 19, 1518
Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment, 2R. [231] 1067
Gas Light and Coke Company, 2R. [230] 229, 232 ; Report, 1128 ; Comm. 1943
Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Comm. [230] 1519, 1522 ; Report, Amendt. 1618, 1620, 1767, 1768 ; [231] 3
Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. [231] 937
Parliamentary Agency, Motion for a Joint Select Committee, [230] 316 ; Res. [231] 1061
Poor Law Amendment, 2R. [230] 1278
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 302

REDMOND, Mr. W. A., *Wexford*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 721
Irish Fines Fund, [229] 672
Post Office—Savings Bank Department—Site, [229] 1866
Prisons (Ireland), [227] 264
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 542

REED, Mr. E. J., *Pembroke*
Administration of the Navy, Motion for a Royal Commission, [230] 436, 442
Army—Volunteer Review in Hyde Park, [230] 501
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1653, 1654
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1895, 1904, 2016 ; *add. cl.* [231] 20
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 360
Iron-clad Navies, British and Foreign, [227] 1891
Maritime Contracts, Leave, [227] 158, 160
Merchant Service Officers, Res. [229] 799
Merchant Shipping, Leave, [227] 185 ; 2R. 465 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 645 ; *cl.* 9, 1370 ; *cl.* 14, 1377 ; *cl.* 16, 1801, 1802, 1803 ; *cl.* 18, 1805 ; *cl.* 27, 1915, 1916 ; *cl.* 28, 1918, 1919 ; *add. cl.* 1938 ; [229] 55, 67 ; Lords Amendts. Consid. [231] 1173
Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1605
Museum of Science (South Kensington), [231] 1070
Naval Cadet College—Milford Haven, [228] 878
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
Devonport, New Dock at, [229] 41
H.M.S. "Thunderer, [231] 1072, 1205
Naval Officers and the Press, [229] 36
Navy—Henwood, Mr. C., Petition of, Res. [227] 1404 ; [228] 343 ; Motion for a Select Committee, [229] 1610, 1617
Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [228] 1549, 1552
Coast Guard Service—Naval Reserve, &c. [228] 1553
Dockyards, &c. [230] 468
Men and Boys, &c. [227] 1940
Scientific Departments, [230] 462
Seamen and Marines, [228] 1547
Steam Machinery, &c. [230] 472, 473

[*cont.*

REED, Mr. E. J.—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the Session, [231] 123
Privy Council (Oaths taken by Members, &c.), Address for Returns, [228] 2030, 2037
Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 853
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 510
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1364

Registration of Births and Deaths — Friendly Societies Act, 1875—*Certificates of Deaths*
Question, Mr. Waddy; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 21, [227] 558; Question, Mr. Ashbury; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 16, [228] 71; Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 3, 1096; Question, Mr. W. Holms; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 6, 1325

Registration of Births and Deaths (Ireland) Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Donoughmore*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *August* 8 (No. 208)

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Smyth, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Sullivan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 4]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 3, [229] 1
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Gibson*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 168, N. 235; M. 67
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off

Registry of Deeds (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 6 [Bill 233]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 5

REPTON, Mr. G. W. J., *Warwick*
Metropolis—Hyde Park—Rotten Row, [231] 516

RICHARD, Mr. H., *Merthyr Tydvil*
Army Estimates, Res. [227] 1445
China—Chinese Consul at Hong Kong, [231] 119
Papers, The, [227] 136
China, Res. [230] 536
Coolie Immigration from India to Guiana, [227] 1716
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 715
Dahomey — Bombardment, The Threatened, [229] 671
Electors, Registration of — Parochial Relief, [227] 1205
Elementary Education — School Fees, [229] 1517

RICHARD, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 57; Comm. Amendt.* 1186; *cl.* 5, 1300; *cl.* 6, 1411; *cl.* 12, 1450; *add. cl.* 1897; [231] 17; Consid. *cl.* 14, 528; 3R. 566
Elementary Education Act, 1870 — Miscellaneous Questions
Briston School District, [228] 696
Cardiff School Board, [231] 703
School Board Schools—Religious Instruction, [227] 483
School Board Teachers, [228] 966
Jamaica—Mr. P. A. Smith, District Judge, [230] 1622
Poor Law Amendment, Consid. Amendt. [230] 482

RICHMOND AND GORDON, Duke of (Lord President of the Council)
Agricultural Children Act, [227] 131
Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, 1875, Motion for Returns, [229] 1261, 1343, 1344; [230] 2
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 1R. [228] 691; 2R. 1383; Comm. *cl.* 23, [229] 185; *cl.* 46, 186; 3R. Amendt. 350
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [229] 917
Bishopric of Truro, 2R. [231] 669
Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 605, 609, 615, 629
Burials in Churchyards, 2R. Amendt. [229] 1095
Cattle Disease (Ireland), 2R. [231] 666
Cattle Diseases (England and Ireland)—Privy Council Regulations, [227] 126
Church of Scotland (Election of Ministers), Motion for Returns, [228] 1385
Church Temporalities (Ireland), Motion for a Return, [230] 611
Commons, 2R. [230] 1029, 1039; Comm. *cl.* 8, 1428, 1429; *cl.* 19, 1430; *cl.* 20, 1431; Report, *cl.* 8, 1518; *cl.* 19, *ib.*; *cl.* 30, 1519
Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment, 2R. [231] 1067
Criminal Law—Police Constable Maconachie, Case of, [228] 600
Cruelty to Animals, [229] 1340; Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 120; *cl.* 11, 126
Dover Harbour, Petition, [229] 1106, 1109
Drugging of Animals, 2R. [229] 262
Education—Reports for the Year 1875, [229] 1260
Schools, [231] 514
Egypt—Cave, Mr., Mission of, [227] 202
Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 775; Comm. *cl.* 4, 938; *cl.* 5, *ib.*; *cl.* 9, 940; *cl.* 10, *ib.*; *cl.* 12, 941; *cl.* 14, *ib.*; *cl.* 15, 942; *cl.* 18, 944; *add. cl.* 945
Endowed Schools Commissioners, Motion for Returns, [230] 391
Erne Lough and River, &c., 2R. [231] 688
Gas Light and Coke Company, 2R. [230] 230; Report, 1130
Gas Light and Coke Company—South Metropolitan Gas Company, Motion for Returns, [230] 612
Grand Juries (Ireland), Res. [229] 1410
India—Indian Tariff, [227] 2007
Irish Peerage, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 1905; Report, [229] 204
Juries Procedure (Ireland), 2R. [231] 496

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

RICHMOND AND GORDON, Duke of—*cont.*
  Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Comm. [230] 1521
  Lords Lieutenant—Choice of Magistrates, Personal Explanation, [231] 367
  Mercantile Marine — Training Ships, [227] 1791, 1792
  Mercantile Marine—"Franconia" and "Strathclyde," Collision, Motion for Papers, [231] 1061
  Merchant Shipping, 2R. [230] 317; Comm. *cl.* 20, 1132; *cl.* 21, 1133; *cl.* 25, *ib.*; Report, *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1433; *cl.* 24, Amendt. *ib.*
  Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Serpentine, [228] 1393
    Hyde Park Corner, Traffic at, [227] 549
    Northumberland Avenue, [228] 1394
  Metropolis (Whitechapel and Limehouse) Improvement Scheme Confirmation, Comm. [230] 942; 3R. 1040
  National Education (Ireland), Motion for Returns, [230] 394
  National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875, [229] 357, 362
  Noxious Vapours, [227] 791
  Owners of Land (Ireland)—New "Domesday Book," [230] 944
  Parliament—Whitsuntide Recess, [229] 1254
  Parliamentary Agency, Motion for a Joint Select Committee, [230] 317
  Poor Law Amendment, 2R. [230] 1273, 1278; Comm. *add. cl.* 1472, 1473
  Poor Law Rating (Ireland), 2R. [231] 499
  Primary Education, Motion for Returns, [229] 99
  Publicans Certificates (Scotland), 2R. [229] 485; Comm. *cl.* 13, [230] 104
  Railway Accidents — Royal Commission, Report, [227] 664
  Royal Irish Academy, Motion for Correspondence, [230] 493
  Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 821, 827
  Scottish Teinds, Returns, [227] 1118
  Sea Insurances (Stamping of Policies), 2R. [228] 691
  Sulphurous Acid, &c., Address for a Royal Commission, [228] 607
  Trade Union Act (1871) Amendment, 2R. [229] 1259
  University of Oxford, Comm. [228] 821; *cl.* 35, 1315
  Vivisection, [227] 2008

RIDLEY, Mr. M. W., *Northumberland, N.*
  Army—Yeomanry Adjutants, [228] 1908
  Elementary Education, 2R. [229] 1907
  Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 52

RIPLEY, Mr. H. W., *Bradford*
  Parliament—Privilege—Political Committee of the Reform Club, Res. [229] 1672
  Pollution of Rivers, [230] 1282; 2R. 1676
  Rivers Pollution—The Clyde, [228] 1909

RIPON, Marquess of
  Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 798; Comm. *cl.* 5, 938, 939; *cl.* 12, 941; *cl.* 16, 943

RITCHIE, Mr. C. T., *Tower Hamlets*
  Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, [227] 1775
  China, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [230] 569
  Civil Service, [227] 677
  Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1293; *cl.* 6, 1403; *add. cl.* 1645, 2003, 2016; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 481
  Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 740
  Holland—Sugar Duties, [228] 1478
  Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 5, [228] 1155; *cl.* 14, 1375; *cl.* 15, 1615; *cl.* 16, 1793, 1802; Consid. *cl.* 18, [229] 1073
  Metropolitan Fire Brigade, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 353, 370
  Metropolitan Railway, 2R. [227] 809
  Parliament—Business of the House—Notices of Motion, [227] 1718
    Order — Balloting for Motions, [230] 13, 259
  Parliament—Private Bills—Canvassing in the House, Res. [227] 1495
  Sugar Convention, 1864—Holland, [227] 562
  Supply—Royal Parks and Gardens, [229] 1583
  Turkey—Bulgaria, Alleged Atrocities in, [231] 875
  Westminster, Palace of — The Clock Tower, [229] 917

Rivers Pollution
  Clyde, The, Question, Mr. Ripley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 1, [228] 1909
  Legislation, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 4, [229] 45; Question, Mr. Cawley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 15, 671
  Thames Valley Drainage—Report of Colonel Cox, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 10, [228] 1484
    The Report . . . . *P.P.* 184
  Thames Water, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 24, [228] 1578

Rivers Pollution Commission—The Report
  Question, Mr. A. Brown *June* 23, [230] 384 [House counted out]

Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill
  (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *Mar* 30, [228] 914; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 118]
  Question, Mr. Dalrymple; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 11, [229] 366
  Read 2° * *June* 15
  Bill withdrawn * *July* 31

ROCHESTER, Bishop of
  Felstead School—The Rev. W. Grignon, Dismissal of, [228] 1754

RODWELL, Mr. B. B. H., *Cambridgeshire*
  Agricultural Children Act—Henry Cole, Case of, [229] 46
  Criminal Law—Thomas Hare, Case of—Cumulative Penalties, [230] 1137

[*cont.*

Rodwell, Mr. B. B. H.—*cont.*
- Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. Amendt. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1927
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 7, 1417;
230] *cl.* 11, 1440; *cl.* 20, 1500; *cl.* 34, Amendt. 1511, 1513; *add. cl.* 2017
231] 65; Consid. *cl.* 14, 548
- Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. Amendt. [229] 1177
- Parliament—Public Bills—Referees, Motion for a Select Committee, [227] 491
- Parliamentary Agency, Res. [231] 330
- Prisons, 2R. [230] 302
- Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1448
- Railway Passenger Duty, Res. Amendt. [227] 1590
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1314

Roebuck, Mr. J. A., *Sheffield*
- Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1659, 1662, 1723, 1891, 1904
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 128
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1355
- Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 626

Ronayne, Mr. J. P., *Cork City*
- Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 111

Rosebery, Earl of
- Egypt—Cave, Mr,. Mission of, [227] 202
- Heligoland, Address for Papers, [227] 1851, 1855
- Irish Peerage, 2R. [228] 1172; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1899
- Patents for Inventions, 2R. [227] 1944
- Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 1081

Rothschild, Sir N., *Aylesbury*
- Privilege—Messrs. Rothschild, [227] 1020

Roumania
- *Reported Commercial Treaty*, Question, Observations, Lord Campbell; Reply, The Earl of Derby *August* 14, [231] 1192
- *The New Tariff*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Spinks; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 3, [230] 852

Royal Style and Titles, The
- Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 14, [227] 2013
- *The Native Princes of India*, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 13, [227] 1867

Royal Titles Act
- *Commissions in the Militia*, Question, Mr. W. E. Price; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 5, [229] 106
- *The Council of India*, Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 7, [227] 1568

[*cont.*

Royal Titles Act—cont.
- *The Title of "Empress"—The Corporation of Dublin*, Question, Mr. T. E. Smith; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 4, [229] 40
    - Paper 172
    - The Proclamation . . . . . [1436]

Royal Titles Act (*Proclamation*)

Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Disraeli
228] *Mar* 30, 881; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 24, 1574; Question, Mr. Fawcett, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, Mr. Disraeli; short debate thereon *April* 25, 1629; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 27, 1764; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Fawcett*); after debate, Motion withdrawn

Questions, Sir Henry James, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Disraeli, The Attorney General *May* 2, 1982

Notice of Resolution, Sir Henry James; short debate thereon *May* 4, [229] 51

Orders of the Day postponed (*Mr. Disraeli*)

Moved, "That, having regard to the declarations made by Her Majesty's Ministers during the progress of the Royal Titles Act through Parliament, this House is of opinion that the Proclamation issued by virtue of that Act does not make adequate provision for restraining and preventing the use of the title of Empress in relation to the internal affairs of Her Majesty's dominions other than India" (*Sir Henry James*) *May* 11, 370; after long debate, Question put; A. 226, N. 334; M. 108

Division List, A. and N., 470

Royal Titles Bill

(*Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Lord George Hamilton*)

c. Orders of the Day postponed *Feb* 17

Paragraph from Her Majesty's Speech read
227] Motion for Leave (*Mr. Disraeli*) *Feb* 17, 407; after debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered

Read 1°* *Feb* 21 [Bill 83]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 9, 1719

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Samuelson*); after long debate, Question put; A. 31, N. 284; M. 253

Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
228] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 16, 75

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "while willing to consider a measure enabling Her Majesty to make an addition to the Royal Style and Title, which shall include such Dominions of Her Majesty as to Her Majesty may seem meet, this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to impair the ancient and Royal dignity of the Crown by the assumption of the style and title of Emperor" (*The Marquess of Hartington*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Thomas Cave*); Question put; A. 192, N. 324; M. 132

[*cont.*

Royal Titles Bill—cont.

Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. James*); Motion withdrawn

Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 305, N. 200; M. 105

228] Division List, A. and N., 160

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.

Committee; Report *Mar* 20, 272

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *Mar* 23, 480; after debate, Question put; A. 209, N. 134; M. 75; Bill read 3°

Division List, A. and N., 517

Notice of Motion, Mr. Fawcett *Mar* 24, 563

l. Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *Mar* 24 (No. 41)

Read 2ª, after long debate *Mar* 30, 821

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee" *April* 3, 1039

Amendt. to leave out from ("That") and insert ("an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as follows: That this House ventures to approach Her Majesty in sincere and earnest devotion to Her Majesty's person and dignity, with an humble and hearty prayer that She may be graciously pleased to assume a Title more in accordance than the Title of Empress with the history of the Nation and with the loyalty and feelings of Her Majesty's most faithful subjects") (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *v.*; after long debate, on Question, "That the words, &c.?" Cont. 137, Not-Cont. 91; M. 46

Resolved in the affirmative; Committee; Report

Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont., 1092

Read 3ª, after short debate *April* 7, 1386

Royal Assent *April* 27 [39 *Vict.* c. 10]

c. Notices, Mr. Cowen, Mr. Charles Lewis; Observations, Mr. Speaker *April* 27, 1757

l. Personal Explanation, The Duke of Buccleuch *Mar* 28, 689; Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *April* 6, 1301; Observations, Lord Selborne; Reply, The Lord Chancellor; short debate thereon *May* 2, 1953

c. Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 3, 1097

RUSSELL, Sir C., *Westminster*

Criminal Law—Public Prosecutor, [229] 1189

Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [231] 20

South Eastern Railway, 2R. [227] 1705; Motion for Adjournment, [228], 59, 62

Russia and Corea

Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 17, [228] 170

Russia and the Khanate of Khokand—See title *Asia, Central*

RUTLAND, Duke of

Burials in Churchyards, 2R. [229] 1090

RYDER, Mr. G. R. D., *Salisbury*

Criminal Law—Prisoners awaiting Trial, [228] 702

Untried Prisoners, [229] 488

RYLANDS, Mr. P., *Burnley*

Army—Drill and Exercise in Hot Weather, [230] 1526

Commons, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 1251; *add. cl.* 1570

Crossed Cheques, Comm. *cl.* 4, [230] 1515

Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. Amendt. [229] 673; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1197

230] Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 11, Motion for reporting Progress, 1421; *cl.* 14, Motion for reporting Progress, 1435; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1495; *cl.* 16, 1496; Postponed *cl.* 8, 1529; *add. cl.* 1652, 1853, 1892, 1909, 1911; Amendt, 2001

231] Consid. *cl.* 14, 530

Exchequer Bonds, Comm. *cl.* 2, [227] 1399

House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [229] 1598

Inland Revenue—Duties on Offices of Profit, [229] 48

Friendly and Building Societies—Fees on Certificates, [228] 1096

Malta, Taxation in, Res. [229] 1988

Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 16, [228] 1799; *cl.* 28, 1919; *add. cl.* [229] 213

Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1603

Navy Estimates—Coastguard Service, Naval Reserve, &c., Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 1552

Dockyards, &c. Amendt. [230] 462

Men and Boys, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, [227] 1942

Repairs, [229] 1920

Scientific Departments of the Navy, Motion for reporting Progress, [229] 258, 2019; Motion for reporting Progress, 2020, 2021; Amendt. [230] 456, 461

Seamen and Marines, [228] 1546

Parliament—Public Business, [228] 1744, 1762

Sessional Order—Exclusion of Strangers, Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1495

Prisons, 2R. Amendt. [230] 274, 934, 936

Royal Titles—The Proclamation, [228] 881

Suez Canal, Management of, [229] 181

Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 835, 839, 840, 845

Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1467, 1468

New Courts of Justice and Offices, [229] 1592

Report, [229] 1757

Tonnage Bounties, &c. [229] 1660

Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1134

Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1353, 1355

SACKVILLE, Mr. G. STOPFORD-, *Northampton, N.*

Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1353

ST. ALBANS, Duke of
Agricultural Children Act, [227] 130
Army—Martini-Henry Rifle, [227] 666
Reserve Forces—Yeomanry Trumpeters, [229] 1254

Saint Vincent, Tobago, and Grenada Constitution Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Carnarvon*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *July* 3 (No. 156)
Read 2ª, after short debate *July* 6, [230] 1039
Committee*; Report *July* 7
Read 3ª* *July* 10
c. Read 1º* (*Mr. J. Lowther*) *July* 18 [Bill 253]
Read 2º* *July* 24
Committee*; Report *July* 28
Read 3º* *July* 31
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 47]

Saint Vincent (*Treatment of Coolies*)
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies or Extracts of any Correspondence which may have passed from the 1st day of August 1875 to the present date, between the Governor of the Windward Islands, the Lieutenant Governor of Saint Vincent, and the Colonial Office, relative to alleged abuses in treatment of Coolies in Saint Vincent" (*Mr. Errington*) *Mar* 14, [227] 2073; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Return of Numbers . . . *P.P.* 249

Sale of Coal Bill
(*Mr. Gourley, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Hamond, Mr. Dodds, Sir Henry Havelock, Mr. Ashbury*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1º* *April* 26 [Bill 132]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 10

Sale of Food and Drugs Act—Public Analysts
Question, Mr. Watkin Williams; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 3, [227] 1293

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill (*Mr. Wilson, Mr. Birley, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. James*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 10 [Bill 57]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 29

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Richard Smyth, The O'Conor Don, Mr. James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Dease, Mr. Thomas Dickson, Mr. Redmond*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 9 [Bill 38]
Bill withdrawn* *Mar* 29

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Richard Smyth, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Dease, Mr. Thomas Dickson, Mr. Redmond*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *June* 14 [Bill 194]
Read 2º, after debate *July* 12, [230] 1333
Question, Mr. R. Smyth; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 18, 1524; Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. R. Smyth *July* 29, [231] 59
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 2, 303
Amendt to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Maurice Brooks*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Debate adjourned
Observations, Sir Wilfrid Lawson *August* 3, 424
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Bill withdrawn* *August* 3

SALISBURY, Marquess of (Secretary of State for India)
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. [228] 1383
Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 647
Companies Acts (1862 and 1867) Amendment, 2R. [231] 1067
Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [228] 165, 168; Comm. Amendt. 345, 347
Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 802; Comm. *cl.* 16, 943
Gaslight and Coke Company, Comm. [230] 1944, 1945; 3R. [231] 368
India—Miscellaneous Questions
Council of India—Indian Tariff, [227] 1960, 1978, 1988; [228] 921, 924, 926, 1378
Languages—Indian Civil Service, [230] 1467, 1469
Sirdar Narain Singh, Petition of, [229] 772
Indian Government, Address for Papers, [231] 507
Intemperance, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 729
Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Comm. [230] 1522
Metropolitan Gas Bills, Report, [230] 1130
Owners of Land (Ireland)—New "Domesday Book," [230] 944
Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [231] 814
Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 865, 867, 871, 872
Slave Trade, 1R. [230] 236; 2R. 735; Comm. *cl.* 1, 849, 850; 3R. 943
Union of Benefices, 2R. Amendt. [229] 757, 759, 762; Comm. *cl.* 18, [230] 938; *cl.* 32, 939
University of Cambridge, [228] 468
227] University of Oxford, 1R. 791, 805; 2R. 1693, 1696
228] Comm. 820, 930; *cl.* 4, 933; *cl.* 6, 938; *cl.* 10, *ib.*; *cl.* 12, 939, 940; *cl.* 14, 942; *cl.* 15, 948, 954; *cl.* 16, 959, 1303, 1304

[*cont.*

Salisbury, Marquess of—*cont.*
228] 1305, 1307; *cl.* 17, *ib.*; *cl.* 19, 1308;
. *cl.* 24, 1310; *cl.* 25, 1312, 1314; *cl.* 33,
. 1315; *add. cl.* 1316; Report, *cl.* 4, 1949;
. *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1950, 1951; *add. cl. ib.*,
. 1952; *cl.* 28, *ib.*; *cl.* 37, 1953
229] 3R. Amendt. 101, 102
University of Oxford—Commissioners, [228] 262, 348, 598, 599

Salmon Fisheries Act, 1861—*The Solway*
Question, Mr. Stafford Howard; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 10, [230] 1175

Salmon Fisheries Act, 1873
Fishery Board, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 15, [229] 1893
Salmon Fisheries Inspectors' Report—The River Wye, Question, Mr. Clive; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 9, [229] 264; *June* 16, 1972
15th Report of Inspectors (England and Wales) . . . . [1466]
(Ireland), for 1875 . . . . . . [1467]

Salmon Fisheries Bill
(*Mr. Assheton, Mr. Robertson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 11 [Bill 60]
Read 2° * *Mar* 10
Committee *; Report *May* 1
Read 3° * *May* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Winmarleigh*) *May* 5 (No. 72)
Read 2ª * *May* 30
Committee *; Report *June* 1
Read 3ª * *June* 13
Royal Assent *June* 27 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 19]

Salmon Fishery Provisional Order Bill
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 17 [Bill 110]
Read 2° * *May* 11
Bill withdrawn * *June* 15

Salt, Mr. T., *Stafford*
Poor Law—Out-Door Relief, [228] 876

Samuda, Mr. J. D'A., *Tower Hamlets*
Iron-clad Navies, British and Foreign, [227] 1915
227] Merchant Shipping, 2R. 458
228] Comm. *cl.* 3, 893, 905; *cl.* 4, 912; *cl.* 5,
. 1151; *cl.* 9, 1370; *cl.* 16, 1797; *cl.* 19,
. 1881; *cl.* 27, 1916, 1917; *add. cl.* 1936,
. 1937, 1939
229] *add. cl.* 55, 91, 209, 234; Consid. *add. cl.*
. 1058, 1061; *cl.* 20, 1078; *cl.* 22, 1080
Metropolitan Railway, 2R. [227] 808
Navy—Henwood, Mr. Charles Frederick, Case of, Motion for a Select Committee, [229] 1618
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1089
Navy—Ships of War, Res. [229] 248
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [230] 467
Steam Machinery, &c. [230] 473
Spain—Tonnage Dues, [227] 813

Samuelson, Mr. B., *Banbury*
Egypt—Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Report, [228] 621;—Decrees of May 2nd, [229] 918
Patent Office and Museum, [229] 1421
Railway Accidents, Commission on, Report, [227] 301, 928
Royal Titles, [227] 1568, 1569; 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1727, 1749, 1759; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [228] 329, 335
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [227] 511
Turkey—Salonica, Murder of the Consuls at, [229] 1113

Sandford, Mr. G. M. W., *Maldon*
Army—Hythe, Military Scandal at, [227] 259, 1219
Commons, 2R. [227] 536; Comm. [229] 1231; *cl.* 2, 1396; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1531; *add. cl.* 1567, 1674; Consid. Amendt. [230] 134, 136
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 970
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [230] 1290; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1410
Elementary Education Act, 1870—Clause 6, [229] 1188, 1189
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [227] 471
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 355
Suez Canal, Management of, [229] 181
Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1760
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [228] 1133

Sandhurst, Lord
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 1110, 1117; [229] 916
Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [228] 168
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 1077

Sandon, Right Hon. Viscount (Vice President of Committee of Council on Education), *Liverpool*
Art Library, South Kensington, [229] 104, 105
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2067
Education—Miscellaneous Questions
Canal Population, [230] 859
Government Inspectors and Secondary Schools, [230] 1396
Legislation, [227] 1714
Queen's Speech, [228] 620
Teachers of Public Elementary Schools, [231] 259
Education Code—Subjects, Choice of, Res. [227] 1809
Education Department—Keynsham British School, [229] 1894, 1895, 1974; [230] 246; [231] 257
Pupil Teachers, [231] 1069
229] Elementary Education, Leave, 929 (see
. Appendix), 949, 953, 957, 961, 963
230] 2R. 84 (see Appendix); Comm. 1257 (see Ap-
. pendix), 1266, 1287; *cl.* 3, *ib.*, 1288; *cl.* 4, 1290,
. 1291; Amendt. 1293, 1295, 1296, 1297; *cl.* 5,
. Amendt. *ib.*, 1298, 1299, 1301; *cl.* 6, 1400, 1401,
. 1402, 1407, 1408, 1409, 1410, 1411, 1412;
. *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1413, 1414, 1415, 1416, 1417;
. Amendt. 1418; *cl.* 11, *ib.*, 1419, 1420, 1444,

[*cont.*

Sandon, Right Hon. Viscount—*cont.*

[230] 1448; *cl.* 12, 1449, 1450; *cl.* 14, 1451, 1453; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1496; *cl.* 16, *ib.*, 1497; *cl.* 17, 1498; *cl.* 19, *ib.*; *cl.* 20, 1499, 1500; *cl.* 23, 1502; *cl.* 26, *ib.*; *cl.* 28, 1507, 1508; *cl.* 29, 1509; *cl.* 33, 1510; *cl.* 34, 1512; Amendt. 1514; Postponed *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1528, 1529, 1530, 1531; *cl.* 9, *ib.*; *cl.* 10, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1532; *add. cl. ib.*, 1534, 1535, 1536, 1540, 1541, 1542, 1544, 1545; Motion for reporting Progress, 1546, 1640, 1648, 1659, 1662, 1663, 1664, 1666, 1672, 1675, 1701, 1702, 1705, 1714, 1716, 1718, 1823, 1875, 1876, 1895, 1901, 1903, 1904, 1906; Amendt. 1907, 1908, 1976, 1986, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010

[231] *add. cl.* 10, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 60, 62, 65, 67; Schedule 1, 68; Amendt. 69; Amendt. 70; Amendt. 71; Schedule 2, Amendt. *ib.*, 72; Consid. 446; *add. cl.* 470, 471, 472; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 473; *cl.* 8, 475; *cl.* 14, 476, 491, 494, 518, 528; Amendt. 529, 538, 546, 547, 549, 551; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 552; Amendt. 553; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 554; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 555; *cl.* 25, Amendt. *ib.*, 556; 3R. 589; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1222

Elementary Education Bill—Poor Educational Districts, [229] 1192
- School Fees, [229] 1517
- The Amendments, [230] 1142

Elementary Education Act — Miscellaneous Questions
- Certificated Children — Clause 14, [230] 1630
- Public Elementary Schools, [227] 1204
- Religious Instruction, [227] 483
- Wrentham, [227] 1415

Elementary Education Act, 1870 — Miscellaneous Questions
- Armley National School, [230] 1528
- Attendance at Schools, [229] 1037
- Briston School District, [228] 697
- Cardiff School Board, [228] 171; [229] 47; [231] 703
- Clause 6, [229] 1188;—School Boards, 1520, 1896
- Compulsory Attendance — George Beavis, Case of, [227] 228
- "Godless Education," [228] 267
- John Speers, Case of, [227] 481
- London School Board, [229] 206
- Pupil Teachers, [228] 877
- School Board Teachers, [228] 966
- Science in Elementary Schools, [228] 1405

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1258; Amendt. 1267, 1297, 1299

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London), Comm. [231] 1187

Elementary Education (Scotland) — Scotch Education Code, 1876, [228] 1406

Endowed Schools—Miscellaneous Questions
- Perse Grammar School, [229] 1763
- St. John's Hospital, Exeter, [229] 38
- Tideswell Grammar School, [229] 1515

Endowed Schools Commissioners—Exeter Endowed Schools Scheme, [227] 134;—Nuneaton Grammar School, [228] 702

Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1015

Medical Degrees—"Conjoint Examinations," [227] 1709

[*cont.*

Sandon, Right Hon. Viscount—*cont.*

Museum of Science (South Kensington), [231] 1070

National Museum and Institute of Science and Art for Ireland, [230] 1809

Parliament—Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill, Explanation, [230] 1178

Primary Education, [228] 1411

Public Health—Medical Officer to the Privy Council, [229] 1517;—Quack Medicines, [228] 269

Supply—Charity Commission, [227] 505
- Public Education in England and Wales, [231] 260
- Public Education in Scotland, [231] 266, 268
- Science and Art Department, [231] 263

United States — International Exhibition, Philadelphia — British Commission, [230] 1479

Sandwich, Earl of

Army—Militia, Paymasters in the, [230] 847

Lords Lieutenant — Choice of Magistrates—Personal Explanation, [231] 365

Savings Banks and Friendly Societies—Deficiencies—Legislation

Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, [228] 271

Savings Banks (Barrister) Bill

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Attorney General*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 24 [Bill 269]
Read 2° * *July* 27
Committee *; Report *July* 28
Read 3° * *July* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 31
Read 2ª * *August* 7 (No. 198)
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 52]

Schomberg's (Duke of Leeds) Pension Commutation

Vote in Supply *August* 5, [231] 755; after debate, Vote agreed to

Science and Art

Arctic Expedition, The, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 17, [227] 401;—*Officers of the Pandora*, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 23, [229] 1110;—*The Admiralty Instructions*, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 26, [230] 422

Art Library (*South Kensington*), Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *Mar* 7, [227] 1567; Questions, Mr. Torrens, Mr. John Bright; Answers, Viscount Sandon *May* 5, [229] 101

British Museum, The—Salaries, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 3, [230] 858

Museum of Science (*South Kensington*), Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Viscount Sandon *August* 11, [231] 1070

[*cont.*

Science and Art—cont.
National Gallery, Question, Sir John Leslie; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *July* 3, [230] 856;—*The New Buildings*, Questions, Mr. Cowper-Temple, Mr. Monk; Answers, Lord Henry Lennox *May* 30, [229] 1422;—*The Turner Pictures*, Question, Lord Francis Hervey; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *June* 29, [230] 618;—*The Wynn Ellis Bequest*, Question, Mr. Hankey; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 21, [227] 560
Report for 1875 . . . . *P.P.* 12
Patent Office and Museum (*South Kensington*), Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 30, [229] 1421
South Kensington Museum—Gratuities to the Police, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 15, [231] 1230
The Transit of Venus, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 10, [230] 1169
[See title *Fine Arts—The Continental States*]

Scientific Instruction—Report of the Royal Commission
Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 21, [227] 551

Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G. (President of the Local Government Board), *Hampshire, N.*
Births and Deaths, Registration of—Medical Certificates, [227] 558
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [229] 1531
Corrupt Practices at Elections Act—Yarmouth Election, [229] 1897
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1665
Elementary Education Act—Poor Law Relief, [227] 1417
Highway Boards, [228] 967
Highways, Leave, [228] 1554
Inland Revenue—Public Health Act, 1875—Proxy Stamp, [228] 1410
Local Finance—Indebtedness of Local Authorities, [229] 1354
Local Government Act—Harrowgate Board of Health, [229] 1896
Local Taxation—Queenborough, [230] 1397
Noxious Nuisances, Legislation, [227] 405
Owners of Land (England)—New "Domesday Book," [228] 1577, 1758;—England and Wales, [229] 1973
Pollution of Rivers, [229] 45, 671; Leave, 1599; [230] 1282; 2R. 1675, 1879, 1880; Consid. [231] 283; 3R. 557
Poor Law—Miscellaneous Questions
Bath Board of Guardians, [231] 254
Charlotte Hammond, Case of, [229] 1351; [230] 950, 1628
Deportation of Female Paupers, [230] 614
Workhouse Sunday Services (Oldham), [228] 626
228] Poor Law Amendment, 2R. 594; Comm. 1469
229] *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1595, 1596; *cl.* 15, 1764; *cl.* 28, 1766, 1768, 1771; *cl.* 37, Amendt. *ib.*; *add. cl.* 1772, 1773, 1774, 1775, 1777, 1780, 1781

[*cont.*

Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
230] Consid. 479, 480, 481, 482, 483; Amendt. *ib.*, 504
Public Expenditure, [231] 255
Public Health—Miscellaneous Questions
Dairy Farms, Supervision of, [231] 1199
Eagley, Typhoid Fever at, [227] 552; [228] 1474; [231] 422
Medical Officer to the Privy Council, [229] 1517
Public Health Act, 1872—Medical Officers of Health, [231] 419
Public Health Act, 1875 — Local Board Elections, [228] 969
Solihull Sanitary Authority, [229] 1973
Uppingham Drainage and Water Supply—Return of the School, [231] 1206
Water, Impure and Deficient Supply, [231] 6
Public Schools—Uppingham School, [229] 49
Public Works Loans, Comm. [230] 951
Rating Act, 1874 — St. Thomas's Hospital, [228] 1475
Rivers, Pollution of—Thames Water, [228] 1578
Sale of Food and Drugs Act—Public Analysts, [227] 1293
Shrewsbury and Holyhead Road, [229] 263
Supply—Local Government Board, &c. [227] 516, 519, 520, 522
Thames Valley Drainage—Report of Colonel Cox, [228] 1484
Vaccination Acts—Miscellaneous Questions [231] 819
Boards of Guardians, [230] 945
Joseph Abel, Case of, [231] 1155
Keighley Board of Guardians, [230] 1139
Pearce, Mr., Case of, [230] 1884
Prosecutions, [228] 63; — Milner's Case, 477
Valuation of Property, Leave, [227] 239, 254
Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment, Leave, [227] 372; 2R. 1163; Bill withdrawn, [230] 1940
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [228] 1349

Scotland
Miscellaneous Questions
Agricultural Holdings—Legislation, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 28, [227] 1020
Court of Session—Returns, Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, The Lord Advocate *April* 25, [228] 1624
Criminal Law—Case of the "Amelia," Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 9, [227] 1712
Dunkeld Bridge Trust, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Lord Advocate *August* 7, [231] 696
Elementary Education Act—The Scotch Education Code, 1876, Question, Mr. Mackintosh; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 7, [228] 1406
Report of Committee of Council, 1875-6 . . . . [1514]
Code of Regulations, 1876 . . . [1459]
Endowed Schools and Hospitals—Legislation, Question, Sir Edward Colebrooke; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 17, [227] 399

[*cont.*

SCOTLAND—*cont.*

Fatal Fire in Ayr, Question, Lord Lindsay; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 26, [230] 419

Game Laws—Legislation, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 13, [227] 1864

Intestates Act—Small Testate Estates—Legislation, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 24, [227] 818

Law of Hypothec — Legislation, Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Mr. Vans Agnew *Feb* 10, [227] 135

Poor Inspectors—Superannuation, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, The Lord Advocate *April* 4, [228] 1180

Poor Law, Question, Mr. Hope Johnstone; Answer, The Lord Advocate *August* 14, [231] 1204

Poor Law Expenditure, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 24, [227] 817

Poor Law — Medical Relief, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 10, [228] 1483

Private Lunatic Asylums, Question, Mr. Ramsay; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 7, [230] 1134

Public Works Loan Commissioners — Road Trusts, Question, Mr. Ellice; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 3, [230] 872

Roads—Legislation, Question, Lord Dalkeith; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 18, [227] 479

Sasine Office (Edinburgh), Question, Mr. Mackintosh; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 22, [227] 681

Scotch Fisheries — Instructions to Cruisers, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 6, [227] 1418

Scotch Teinds, Question, Observations, The Earl of Minto; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Feb* 29, [227] 1118

Sheriff Courts—Legislation, Question, Mr. Farley Leith; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 14, [227] 264

Scotland—Church of Scotland (Election of Ministers)

Motion for "Regulations, framed and enacted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, to be observed in the election and appointment of Ministers" under the powers conferred upon them by the Patronage Abolition Act; also for returns for each parish in Scotland, in which a vacancy has been filled up or is in the course of being filled up, under any such regulations or interim regulations of the General Assembly stating certain particulars [according to a tabular form set forth in the Motion] (*The Earl of Minto*) *April* 7, [228] 1384; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to

SCOTT, Lord H. J. M. D., *Hampshire, S.*

Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. *cl.* 13, [231] 882
Commons, Comm. [229] 1251, 1385; *cl.* 2, 1393; *cl.* 8, 1529; *cl.* 12, 1533; *cl.* 25, 1564, 1566; Consid. [230] 132; Amendt. 138
New Forest, [230] 1973

SCOURFIELD, Sir J. H., *Pembrokeshire, S.*

Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2057
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [229] 713
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [228] 1269, 1276
"Mistletoe," The—Coroner's Jury, [228] 1761
Navy—Navigation of Her Majesty's Ships, Res. [228] 1653
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 113
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 554
Rating Act, 1874—St. Thomas's Hospital, [228] 1475
Valuation of Property, Leave, [227] 253

Sea and River Banks (Lincolnshire) Bill
(*Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Turnor*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 28 [Bill 213]
Read 2°* *July* 6
Committee*; Report *July* 10
Considered* *July* 13
3R. [Dropped]

Sea Insurances (Stamping of Policies) Bill (*Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Rathbone*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 26]
Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 1, [227] 1187
Committee*; Report *Mar* 2 [Bill 93]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *Mar* 8
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *Mar* 20
Considered* *Mar* 21
Read 3°* *Mar* 22
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Carlingford*) *Mar* 23 (No. 40)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 28, [228] 690
Committee*; Report *Mar* 30
Read 3ª* *Mar* 31
Royal Assent *April* 7 [39 *Vict.* c. 8]

Seal Fisheries Act, 1875

Close Time—International Agreement, Question, Mr. Yeaman; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 14, [227] 263; Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *July* 17, [230] 1480

SEELY, Mr. C., *Lincoln City*

Navy—"Alberta" and "Mistletoe" Collision, Res. [228] 1515
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, Motion for Adjournment, [227] 1095, 1098
Parliament—Public Business, [228] 1986

SELBORNE, Lord

Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords, 1R. [227] 222; 2R. 909
Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 616, 653
Fugitive Slaves — The Circulars — Petition, [227] 1533, 1545, 1551
India—Sirdar Narain Singh, Petition of, [229] 769
Inns of Court—General School of Law, 2R. [228] 1892; Comm. [229] 588
Judicature Act (1873)—Court of Appeal, [229] 1269
Judicature Acts—Cave v. Mackenzie, [230] 1951

[*cont.*

SELBORNE, Lord—*cont.*
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [230] 333
North America—Extradition, [231] 396
Owners of Land (Ireland)—New "Domesday Book," [230] 944
Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 1063, 1067; *cl.* 1, 1095; 3R. 1387, 1953, 1975

Select Vestries
l. Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª *Feb* 8

SELWIN-IBBETSON, Sir H. J. (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Essex, W.*
Convicted Children, Comm. [230] 1028
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1652, 1654
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 909
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1382, 1385
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1880
Police Superannuation—A Committee, [228] 562
Prevention of Crimes Act Amendment, 2R. [229] 1596
Prisons, 2R. [230] 311
Supply—Police, County and Borough, [228] 591
  Report, [227] 996

Settled Estates Act (1856) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Marten, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Gregory*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 14 [Bill 193]
Read 2° * *June* 22
Committee *; Report *June* 26
Read 3° * *June* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Selborne*) *June* 29 (No. 151)
Read 2ª * *July* 10
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 30]

SHAFTESBURY, Earl of
Burials in Churchyards, 2R. [229] 1089
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [229] 1016; Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 121; 3R. 486
Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [227] 1196
Medical Act (Qualifications), 2R. [230] 1881
Mercantile Marine—Training Ships, [227] 1780
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 20, [230] 1131
Metropolis (Whitechapel and Limehouse) Improvement Scheme Confirmation, Comm. [230] 940; 3R. 1041
Royal Titles, Comm. Amendt. [228] 1039

SHAW, Mr. W., *Cork Co.*
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 979

SHERIDAN, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*
Criminal Law—Christos Baumbos, The Convict, [231] 817
Licensing Act, 1872—Burial Clubs, [228] 880, 1099

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Ordered * *Mar* 7
Read 1° * *Mar* 8 [Bill 96]
Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 20, [230] 1623
Read 2° * *August* 4
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 8
Considered * *August* 9 [Bill 289]
Read 3° * *August* 10
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *August* 11 (No. 222)
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *August* 12
Read 3ª * *August* 14
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 70]

SHERLOCK, Mr. Serjeant D., *King's Co.*
Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 450
Holyhead Harbour — Steamship "Edith," Wreck of, [229] 670
Law and Justice—"Kimberley v. Crossley"—Costs, [228] 964, 966
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 904
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 996, 998
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1079
Orphan and Deserted Children (Ireland), 2R. [230] 989
Parliament—Ladies' Gallery, House of Commons, [228] 579
  Public Business, [229] 492
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 349

SHUTE, Major-General C. C., *Brighton*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Army Corps, Mobilization of, [227] 556
  Militia Ballot Act, [229] 1417
  Mobilization of the Forces—Estimates, [229] 1418
  National Rifle Association—Martini-Henry Rifles, [228] 561
Army—Army Recruiting, Res. [227] 1213
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, Res. [227] 1765
Army—Military Forces, Our, Res. [227] 939
Army Estimates—Military Education, Establishments for, [229] 1656, 1657
  Works, Buildings, &c. [229] 1650
Civil Service (Employment of Soldiers), Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1990
India—Banda and Kirwee Booty, [231] 692, 821
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 291, 301, 309
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, Res. [228] 1240, 1242
Police Superannuation—A Committee, [228] 562

SIDEBOTTOM, Mr. T. H., *Staleybridge*
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [231] 1017, 1054
Mines—Coal Mines, Accidents in, [227] 674

SIDMOUTH, Viscount
H.R.H. the Prince of Wales—Nobility of Malta, [229] 362, 1965

Sierra Leone—The Financial Position
Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 22, [229] 1039

Silver, Depreciation of
Select Committee appointed, "to consider and report upon the causes of the depreciation of the price of silver, and the effects of such depreciation upon the exchange between India and England" (*Lord George Hamilton*) *Mar* 3
And, on *Mar* 9, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Goschen (Chairman), Mr. Baxter, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Christopher Beckett-Denison, Mr. Fawcett, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Hermon, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Massey, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. Mulholland, and Mr. W. Shaw
Report of Select Comm. *July* 5—*P.P.* 338

SIMON, Mr. Serjeant J., *Dewsbury*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [230] 1157; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1161; Amendt. 1162; Consid. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [231] 759, 764; *cl.* 7, 769
Barristers and Advocates Fees, 2R. [229] 332
Coroners, Res. [230] 1306
Criminal Law — Bravo, Mr.—The Inquest, [229] 922
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1928
Cuba—Foreigners, Tax on, [230] 867
Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, Motion for Adjournment, [231] 495
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1168
Factory and Workshop Acts, [228] 1761
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 309
Merchant Shipping, Comm. [228] 528; *cl.* 3, 890, 893, 902; *cl.* 9, 1370; *cl.* 14, 1585; *add. cl.* 1934; Amendt. 1942; *add. cl.* [229] 56, 91
Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1605
Palace of Westminster—Mr. Herbert's Picture, [229] 1514
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 8, 621
Parliament—Privilege—Political Committee of the Reform Club, Res. [229] 1672
Pollution of Rivers, Consid. Amendt. [231] 318
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1776, 1780; Consid. Amendt. [230] 477
Prisons, 2R. [230] 314
Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [228] 276, 283, 294, 297; Amendt. 301, 302
Sea Insurances (Stamping of Policies), 2R. [227] 1187
Spain—"Octavia," Seizure of the, [228] 1912; [229] 1113
Sloop "Lark," Seizure of, [228] 702
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1317
Vaccination Acts — Keighley Board of Guardians, [230] 1139

SIMONDS, Mr. W. B., *Winchester*
Army—Winchester Barracks, [230] 249

Slave Trade
Coolie Trade in the Mauritius—The Royal Commission, Question, Observations, The Earl of Kimberley; Reply, The Earl of Carnarvon; short debate thereon *May* 12, [229] 474;—*The Island of Réunion*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 23, [228] 478
Mozambique, Question, Mr. W. Holms; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 20, [230] 128
The Slave Trade in the Red Sea, Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Mr. Bourke *July* 3, [230] 869; *July* 7, 1136; Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Hunt *July* 24, 1815
The Sultan of Zanzibar—See title *Slave Trade* (*East Africa*)—*The Sultan of Zanzibar*

Slave Trade—Reception of Fugitive Slaves—The Circulars
Royal Commission, The—Legislation, Question, Mr. Whitbread; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 11, 227] 230; Nomination of Committee, Mr. Disraeli *Feb* 14, 266; Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Feb* 17, 398;—*The Report*, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 16, [229] 1976
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, a Slave once admitted to the protection of the British Flag should be treated while on board one of Her Majesty's ships as if he were free, and should not be removed from or ordered to leave the ship on the ground of slavery" (*Mr. Whitbread*) *Feb* 22, 685
Amendt. to leave out from "House," and add "in order to maintain most effectually the right of personal liberty, it is desirable to await further information from the Report of a Royal Commission, both as to the instructions from time to time issued to British naval officers, the international obligations of this Country, and the attitude of other States in regard to the treatment of domestic Slaves on board of national ships" (*Mr. Hanbury*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Herschell*); Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *Feb* 24, 820; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 248, N. 293; M. 45
Division List, A. and N., 897
Question proposed, "That the words, 'in order to maintain most effectually the right of personal liberty, it is desirable to await further information from the Report of a Royal Commission, both as to the instructions from time to time issued to British naval officers, the international obligations of this Country, and the attitude of other States in regard to the treatment of domestic Slaves on board of national ships' (*Mr. Hanbury*) be added" *v.*
Amendt. to the said proposed Amendt. to insert, after the word "desirable," the words "provided that the Circular of the 5th day of December 1875 and the East Indies Station Order of 1871, on the subject of Fugitive Slaves, shall not continue in force" (*Mr. Fawcett*); Question put, "That those words be there inserted;" A. 245, N. 290; M. 45

[*cont.*

Slave Trade—Reception of Fugitive Slaves—The Circulars—cont.

Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

227] Notices of Resolutions, Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Mr. Whitbread *Feb* 24, 819

. *Debate in the Commons, The,* Personal Explanation, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *Feb* 25, 903

. *Instructions,* Petition of the three Denominations (*Viscount Cardwell*) *Mar* 7, 1506; after debate, Petition to lie on the Table; Personal Explanation, The Lord Chancellor . *Mar* 9, 1660

230] Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 19, 6;—*The New Circular,* Question, Mr. W. Holms; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 27, . 1962

Coolies, Question, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 20, [228] 254

Parl. Papers—

Report of the Royal Commission . . . . [1516, 1516-I]
Circulars to British Officers [1480]
Correspondence . . . . [1413, 1588]
Instructions issued . . . [1593]
Applications for Instructions 551

Slave Trade (East Africa)—The Sultan of Zanzibar

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that Her Majesty's Government should invite and assist the Sultan of Zanzibar to take such further steps as may be necessary for the total suppression of the Slave Trade within his dominions, and that at the same time more adequate provision should be made for the care and maintenance of the liberated slaves" (*Sir John Kennaway*) *April* 4, [228] 1216; after debate, Motion agreed to

Question, Sir John Kennaway; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 22, [230] 249;—*Treaty with the Sultan of Zanzibar—The Proclamation—Treaty of* 1839, Question, Mr. Mills; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 16, [228] 72; Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 23, [229] 1117

Parl. Papers—

Supplementary Treaty . . . . [1387]
Papers (Dr. Kirk) . . . . . . [1521]

Slave Trade Bill

(*The Marquess of Salisbury*)

l. Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *June* 22
230] 236 (No. 135)
. Read 2ª, after short debate *June* 30, 734
. Committee; Report *July* 3, 848
. Read 3ª, after short debate *July* 4, 943; Protest thereon, [231] 1235
c. Read 1° * *July* 24 [Bill 270]
Read 2° * *July* 27
Committee *; Report *July* 28
Read 3° * *July* 29
l. Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 46]

Small Testate Estates (Scotland) Bill

(*Mr. James Barclay, Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Mackintosh*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 15 [Bill 107]
Read 2° * *Mar* 28
Committee *; Report *May* 8 [Bill 145]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 30
Considered * *June* 1
Read 3° * *June* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Airlie*) *June* 15 (No. 115)
Read 2ª * *June* 27
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *July* 4
Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 24]

Smithfield Prison (Dublin) Bill

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 22 [Bill 163]
Read 2° * *May* 29
Committee *; Report *June* 13
Read 3° * *June* 14
l. Read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners (*The Lord President*) *June* 15 (No. 117)
Read 2ª * *June* 20
Committee * *June* 22
Report * *June* 23
Read 3ª * *June* 26
Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 96]

SMITH, Mr. T. E., *Tynemouth, &c.*

Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. Amendt. [230] 1566, 1616
Council of India (Professional Appointments), 2R. [227] 1282
Empress, Title of—Corporation of Dublin, [229] 40
Greece—"Agrigento," and the "Hylton Castle," [229] 1762; [231] 1206
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 554
India—Bengal Famine, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1838, 1854
Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1837
227] Merchant Shipping, 2R. 440
228] Comm. *cl.* 3, 550, 904; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1147, . 1156; Amendt. 1157; Amendt. 1158, 1159; . *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1160; *cl.* 10, 1371; *cl.* 14, . 1376, 1581, 1587; *cl.* 15, 1593, 1611; . Amendt. 1613; Amendt. 1615; Amendt. . 1617; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1805, 1808; *cl.* 19, . 1883; *cl.* 24, 1885; *cl.* 27, 1916; *add. cl.* . 1923; Amendt. 1937, 1946
229] Comm. *add. cl.* Amendt. 54; Amendt. 57, . 61, 64, 67, 216, 227, 232; Consid. *add. cl.* . 1058, 1060; *cl.* 11, 1070; *cl.* 18, 1074; . 3R. 1335
231] Lords Amendts. Consid. 1173, 1175, 1181, . 1183; Consequential Amendt. 1222
Navy—"Alberta" and "Mistletoe," Collision of, [227] 1203
Ships Boats Lowering, [228] 268
Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. [230] 176
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1640
Royal Titles Act, [228] 1985

MITH, **Mr. W. H.** (Secretary to the Treasury), *Westminster*
- Ardglass Harbour Improvement, Comm. [230] 1763
- Army and Navy Expenditure Accounts, Audit of, [229] 2010
- Bankrupt Banks, 1844-1875—Defective Returns, [230] 129
- Bishopric of Truro, Consid. [231] 72
- Bow Street Police Court (Site), [230] 1625
- Ceylon — Trincomalee, Breakwater at, [230] 1050
- Civil Service Inquiry Commission—Customs Out-Door Department, [229] 1115
- Consolidated Fund, 3R. [228] 566
- County Rates (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [229] 306
- Criminal Law—Constabulary Grants, [231] 9
    - Executions, Expense of, [229] 207
- Crossed Cheques, Re-comm. *cl.* 12, [231] 1221
- Customs—Memorial of Officers, [230] 251, 252
    - Out-door Officers at Outports, [228] 1478
    - Solicitor, Office of the, [231] 701
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 974
- Customs Laws Consolidation, 2R. [229] 1962
- Duke of Schomberg's Pension—Commutation, Res. [231] 757
- Egypt—Mr. Cave's Mission, [228] 567
- Elementary Education, 2R. [230] 66 ; Comm. *cl.* 7, 1416 ; *add. cl.* 1540
- Epping Forest—Forest Commissioners' Scheme, [230] 1624
- Erne Lough and River, Comm. [230] 1764
- Gloucester District Registry, [229] 925
- India—War Office Charges, Res. [231] 655
- Inland Revenue—Duties on Offices of Profit, [229] 48
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    - Civil Service, [228] 1100
    - Irish Fines Fund, [229] 673
    - Kingstown Harbour, [229] 1116
    - Loans, [230] 261
    - Local Taxation, Committee on—Valuation, [231] 1078
    - Phœnix Park, Dublin, [231] 974 ;—Whitefield Lodge, 1072, 1200
    - Registry of Deeds (Dublin), [229] 1117
    - Registry of Deeds Office, Report, [228] 621 ; [230] 419 ;—Mr. Dillon's System, 1046
    - St. Stephen's Green, Dublin, [230] 613
- Law and Justice—Queen's Proctor, [231] 1075
- Legal Departments Commission, 1874—Report, [227] 1838
- Local Taxation, [229] 1185
- Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
    - British Museum—Reading Rooms, [228] 1476 ;—Salaries, 1576
    - Hyde Park—Rotten Row, [231] 516
    - Metropolitan Improvements Models, [228] 350
    - Mint, The—New Site, [231] 421
    - National Gallery—New Buildings, [228] 170 ;—Wynn Ellis Bequest, [227] 560
    - Patent Office and Museum, [229] 1421
    - Serpentine, [228] 479, 970
- Metropolis Gas Act, 1860—Gas Companies Accounts, [229] 205
- Metropolitan Street Traffic—Hyde Park, [228] 352

Smith, **Mr. W. H.**—*cont.*
- Navy and Army Expenditure, 1874-5, Comm. [231] 74 ; Consid. Amendt. 659, 660
- New Forest, [230] 1973 ;—Stoneycross, Inclosure at, [229] 34, 1425 ; [231] 702
- Ordnance Survey — Superannuations, [228] 1481
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
    - Easter Recess, [228] 1100
    - Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London), Explanation, [230] 1179
    - Public Business, [227] 1126 ; [228] 1184, 1744 ; [230] 622
- Post Office—Blue Books, Postage of, [228] 1324, 1409
- Post Office Savings Banks, [229] 1665
- Post Office Telegraph Services (Loan), Res. [227] 1103
- Post Office—Telegraphs—Orkney and Shetland Islands, [229] 1419
- Scotland—King's Park at Stirling, [231] 565
- South Kensington Museum—Gratuities to the Police, [231] 1230
- Supply—British Museum, [231] 265
    - British Seamen Abroad, Relief of Distressed, [229] 1660
    - Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [229] 1333
    - Charity Commission, [227] 504, 506
    - Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 338
    - Civil Service Commission, [227] 506, 508, 514
    - Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission, [227] 515
    - Criminal Prosecutions, &c. England, [227] 1847
    - Diplomatic Services, [231] 656
    - Embassies and Missions Abroad, [228] 1467, 1468
    - Embassy Houses, &c. [229] 1595
    - Exchequer and other Offices in Scotland, [227] 990
    - Fishery Board, Scotland, [227] 992, 993
    - Friendly Societies, Registry of, [227] 515
    - Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [251] 656
    - Local Government Board, &c. [227] 518
    - Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [227] 1839
    - Lunacy Commission, Scotland, [227] 994
    - Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company, [228] 337
    - Metropolitan Police, [228] 591
    - New Courts of Justice and Offices, [229] 1592, 1594
    - Public Buildings, [229] 1585
    - Public Buildings, Ireland, [228] 252
    - Public Education, Ireland, [231] 280
    - Public Works in Ireland, [227] 1845
    - Report, [229] 1756
    - Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland, [228] 252
    - Stationery and Printing, [227] 990
    - Surveys of the United Kingdom, [229] 1590
    - Tonnage Bounties, &c. [229] 1660
    - War Office on account of India, [228] 340, 341
- Telegraphs (Money), 2R. [227] 1489
- War Department Post Office (Remuneration, &c.), Comm. [231] 857
- Ways and Means, Report, [231] 759

[*cont.*

Smollett, Mr. P. B., *Cambridge*
India—Madras Irrigation Works, [228] 698; [230] 420
Royal Titles, 2R. [227] 1754; Comm. [228] 100
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1704

Smyth, Mr. P. J., *Westmeath Co.*
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 751
Law and Justice—Irish Ante-Union Statutes, [228] 1911

Smyth, Mr. R., *Londonderry Co.*
Constabulary Pensioners (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 570
Irish Parliament, [229] 49
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [230] 654
Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1006
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1636
Public Expenditure, [231] 254
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [228] 1812
Public Houses (Ireland)—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 492, 920, 1275
Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [229] 21
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1333, 1524; [231] 59, 432, 434

Somerset, Duke of
Africa, West Coast of—Exchange of Territory, [227] 387
Commons, 2R. [230] 1035; Comm. *cl.* 8, 1428; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1431
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [229] 1613; Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 107, 108, 116, 121; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 127
Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Comm. [230] 1521; Report, 1620
Mercantile Marine — Training Ships, [227] 1790
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [230] 327; Comm. *cl.* 20, 1131; Report, *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1432
Navy—Chain Cables and Anchors, [227] 545, 547
Navy—Iron-clads, Motion for Returns, [227] 1859
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 48
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. [230] 1275
Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 831, 871
University of Oxford, Comm. *cl.* 16, [228] 1305; *cl.* 24, Amendt. 1310
West Coast of Africa—Dahomey, King of, [229] 768

Somerset, Lord H. R. C. (Comptroller of the Household), *Monmouthshire*
Queen's Speech—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, [227] 230

Sotheron-Estcourt, Mr. G. B., *Wilts, N.*
Hyde Park—The Serpentine—Bathing, [230] 855

South Eastern Railway Bill (by Order)
c. 2R. debate adjourned, after short debate *Mar* 9, [227] 1703
Debate resumed *Mar* 16, [228] 59
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Charles Russell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2º

South Kensington Museum — See title *Science and Art*

South Metropolitan Gas Light and Coke Company Bill
l. Bill reported with Amendments; Observations Lord Redesdale; short debate thereon *July* 7 [230] 1128

Spain
Miscellaneous Questions
Cuba—Chinese Coolies, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 29, [230] 616;—*Tax on Foreigners*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 3, 867;—*War Tax in Cuba*, Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 7, [231] 694
Detention of British Subjects—Case of Henry Pratt, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 26, [229] 1272
Miscarriage of Justice—Murder of a British Subject, Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer Mr. Bourke *April* 25, [228] 1626
Seizure of the "Clementina," Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 12, [229] 489
Seizure of the "Octavia," Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Mr. Bourke *May* 1, [228] 1912; *May* 23, [229] 1113
Seizure of the Sloop "Lark," Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 28, [228] 702
The Constitution, Article 11—*Religious Toleration*, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 19, [230] 6
Tonnage Dues, Question, Mr. Samuda; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 24, [227] 813
War Taxes on British Subjects, Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 6, [228] 1321

Speaker, The (Right Hon. H. B. W. Brand), *Cambridgeshire*
Amendment—*Municipal Privileges (Ireland) Bill*, as amended, considered—Mr. Gibson proposed to move, for Mr. I. T. Hamilton, a new clause:—Mr. Speaker ruled that the clause could not be moved in the absence of the hon. Member for the county of Dublin, [231] 662
Amendment—Appropriation Bill—Mr. Speaker was not prepared to say that an Amendment on the *Appropriation Bill* limiting the Supplies to three months would be out of Order, [231] 1161
Amendment—Order—Motion; an Amendment moved thereon—The Motion cannot be withdrawn unless the Amendment be previously

[*cont.*

EAKER, The—*cont.*

withdrawn.—*Electoral County Boards (Ireland)* [227] 787 ;—*Increase of the Episcopate Bill*, [230] 1026

Debate—It is an unusual course for an hon. Member to move the Adjournment of the House on a Question, when those who alone are able to give explanations on the subject are not in their places.—*Leitrim County Election*, [230] 182

Debate—Explanation—An hon. Member in possession of the House is entitled to proceed with his observations until he has concluded. If at their termination a Member [who has been referred to in that speech] desires to offer an explanation, no doubt he will, by the indulgence of the House, be at liberty to do so, [231] 301

Debate—Limit of Personal Explanation—An hon. Member is entitled to make a personal explanation to the House as to his own conduct, and such explanation will no doubt be received with indulgence ; but he is not entitled to enter on other matters.—*Sir Edward Watkin and Sir Robert Peel*, [230] 860, 864

Debate—Latitude in Explanation, [230] 1183

Debate—Order—Speaking a second time—Mr. Speaker : The hon. Member having already addressed the House, cannot make a second speech.—*Commons Bill*, [229] 1250

Debate—Order—It is not competent for a Member who has moved the second reading of a Bill to move the Adjournment of the debate.—*Homicide Law Amendment Bill*, [227] 1659

Debate—Order—A Member who has moved the Adjournment of a debate, which Motion is negatived, is not entitled to address the House further on the original Motion.—*H.M.S. " Vanguard,"* [227] 1098

Debate—Order—A Member [who has already spoken on the Question] may not make a second speech on the Motion that the Debate be adjourned.—*Steamship " Talisman,"* [228] 427

Debate—Order—A Member who has moved an Amendment on the second reading of a Bill has exhausted his right to speak again on the main Question, [230] 100

Debate—Order—Discussion of subject already decided—Committee of Supply—Resolutions reported—*Resolution* 8, *Diplomatic Charges* —Mr. Cameron entered into the case of the " Talisman." Mr. Speaker reminded the hon. Member that the matter to which he was referring had formed the subject of a long debate in the earlier part of the Session, and that it was out of Order to enter into a fresh discussion on the matter unless it distinctly referred to the reduction of the Vote immediately before the House, [231] 749

Order—Orders of the Day—A Member desiring that a certain Order of the Day be discharged, must make a substantive Motion to that effect ;—it cannot be done on a Motion for going into Committee of Supply.—*Business of the House*, [227] 500

Debate — Parliamentary Language — According to the ordinary courtesies of debate Members are spoken of as " honourable Members," [231] 301

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Debate—Unparliamentary Language—The expression "impertinence" used in respect of another Member cannot be allowed in this House.—*Sir Edward Watkin and Sir Robert Peel*, [230] 863

Order—Unparliamentary Language—An hon. Member must not attribute an intention on the part of another Member to insult Members of this House, [228] 2029, 2030

Debate — Unparliamentary Language — Mr. Speaker said that on reflection the hon. and learned Baronet would see that he was applying motives to the conduct of an hon. Member of that House, which were not admissible, [231] 437

Debate—Relevancy of Argument—The Appropriation Bill—The rule of the House is that in the discussion on the Appropriation Bill any observations applying to one of the clauses in the Bill may be made.
Any observations that may be made must be relevant to the Bill, [231] 1119

Debate—Relevancy of Argument, [227] 783, 896 ; [228] 248 ; [229] 1751 ; [230] 1099 ; [231] 1222

Divisions—A Member who had brought forward a Motion himself voted against it. Mr. Speaker said that if when the Question was put the hon. Member gave his vote as he gave his voice, he was in Order, [227] 473

Order—Motion ; an Amendment moved thereon —The Motion cannot be withdrawn unless the Amendment be previously withdrawn. —*Electoral County Boards (Ireland)*, [227] 787 ;—*Increase of the Episcopate Bill*, [230] 1026

Order—Amendment on Lords Amendments— Mr. Speaker said the Question was " That the House do agree with the Lords Amendments." The hon. Member could not move an Amendment, but might negative the Motion when the Question was put.—*Merchant Shipping Bill*, [231] 1176

Order — In answer to question, Mr. Speaker said, it was not for him to rule now whether Members were in Order in former Sessions of Parliament, [231] 1160

Order—Balloting for Motions—According to the Rule of the House a Member can only give Notice of one Motion with a view of obtaining, under the Ballot, priority for such Motion. If two or more Members, holding the same opinions on some specific Motion, combine together to ballot for precedency, with the view of gaining undue precedence to that Motion, such a practice is an evasion of the Rules of the House.—*Business of the House*, [227] 14, 260 ; [230] 1718

Order—Debate—Premature Discussion of a Subject or Motion—It is out of Order to discuss the principle of a Bill not before the House.—*Public Business—Scotch Business*, [229] 2017

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

It is contrary to the practice of this House to consider any Resolution bearing upon a Bill before the other House of Parliament until that Bill has been read in the other House a third time.—*Public Business*, [228] 1183

A Member is out of Order in referring to a subject in reference to which he has a Notice on the Paper, or in referring to the subject of a late debate.—*Supply — Navy Estimates*, [230] 455, 456 ;—*Royal Titles*, [228] 1633

According to the practice of the House, it would not be regular to anticipate by a Question the discussion of a Motion of which Notice has been given.—*Privilege—Irregular Petitions*, [228] 1557, 1559 ;—*Royal Titles Bill*, 1764

An hon. Member is not at liberty, under cover of a Motion for the Adjournment of the House, to discuss the merits of a Bill which is on the Orders of the House, [231] 424, 426

Order—Reference to debates in the other House—It is part of the unwritten law of Parliament that no allusion should be made to the debates and proceedings in the other House of Parliament during the current Session : And Mr. Speaker states it will be his duty on all occasions to enforce that Rule strictly, [229] 1625, 1630 ; [228] 1771

Order—Reference to debates in this House—It is out of Order to quote speeches made in a debate [in this House] during the current Session, [229] 124

But this Rule does not apply to the different stages of a Bill ; and Mr. Speaker states why he thinks the Proclamation under the *Royal Titles Act*, being the consequence and sequel of that Act, may be considered as coming within the exception, [229] 374 ; [231] 434

Order — Debate — Reference to Newspaper Articles—It is quite irregular to quote newspaper articles referring to a debate in this House, [230] 1339

Order—Notice of Question—An hon. Member cannot enter upon any debate upon giving Notice of a Question. He cannot at the same time give Notice of a Question, and move the Adjournment of the House.—*Turkey—The Eastern Question*, [230] 874, 876 ; [229] 51

Nor, on putting a Question, debate the subject by moving the Adjournment of the House, [230] 1135

Limitation of Questions — *Metropolitan Railway Bill*, [227] 1119

Limitation of Answer—*Elementary Education Act—Clause* 6, [229] 1189

Latitude in Answer—In answering a Question a hon. Member is justified in reading a letter if he so desires,—*Customs—Memorial of Officers*, [230] 251

Order—Question—A Question which refers to matters which have passed outside the walls of this House and does not relate to any Bill or Motion before the House, is a Question which, according to the Rules of the House, cannot be put, [228] 1758

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Privilege—Introduction of the Queen's Name—One of the Rules of the House is, that the introduction of the Queen's name into debate, with a view to influence the decision of the House, would certainly be out of Order. At the same time, if the statement of the right hon. Gentleman relates to matters of fact, and is not made to influence the judgment of the House, Mr. Speaker was not prepared to say that, with the indulgence of the House, he might not introduce Her Majesty's name into that statement.—*Privy Council* (*Oaths taken by Members, &c.*), [228] 136, 2037

Privilege—Petitions—The hon. Member for North Warwickshire yesterday moved that an Order for a Petition to which his name was attached without his authority be discharged. That Motion was made without Notice. Mr. Speaker was of opinion that the hon. Member was justified in so doing, because if not a breach of Privilege, certainly a gross irregularity, had been committed by affixing the hon. Gentleman's name to a Petition without his leave, [228] 1400

Privilege—Petitions — It is the duty of every hon. Member presenting a Petition to the House to make himself acquainted with the terms of the Petition, and to see that it is, in its language and expressions, consistent with the Rules of the House. Having satisfied himself that the Petition is consistent with the Rules of the House, it is the duty of the Member presenting the Petition to affix his name to the Petition ; and it is irregular to authorize any other person to affix the name, [228] 1320 ; [229] 586

Privilege—Public Petition from a Foreign Town—A Petition from Inhabitants of a foreign town having been presented, Mr. Speaker, referring to the absence of precedent for such a case, asks to be allowed to consider what course ought to be followed with respect to such a Petition, [228] 1321

See pp. 1411, 1416, 1418

Also see title *Parliament*

Privilege—Whether the letter complained of is a "menace" of such a character as to interfere with the freedom of action of a Member of the House is for the House to decide.—*Political Committee of the Reform Club*, [229] 1672

Privilege—The hon. Baronet having brought before the House a question of breach of Privilege, is bound to submit to the House a Resolution :—

And is bound to produce for the consideration of the House the very letter which is said to have been written.—*Political Committee of the Reform Club*, [229] 1671

Privilege — Exclusion of Strangers — Notice taken that Strangers are present : Whereupon Mr. Speaker read the Resolution on the subject which was adopted by the House last Session, and said that, unless otherwise directed, he should abide by that Resolution ; and accordingly, without further debate, put the Question, "That Strangers be ordered to withdraw," [227] 1405

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Subsequently, Mr. Speaker draws special attention to this subject, 1420

And explains the course he proposes to adopt, [230] 1555

Privilege — Exclusion of Strangers — The Ladies Galleries — Mr. Speaker explains that there are two Galleries of this House appropriated to the use of ladies. One of these is under Mr. Speaker's control, and the other is available for the use of friends of Members, under the orders of Members, in the usual manner. If strangers are excluded from the House, that will not affect ladies, because the Ladies Gallery is not supposed to be within the House. And Mr. Speaker explains the course he has directed on occasion of the debate on Motion for Second Reading of the *Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal Bill*, [230] 1553, 1554, 1555

Private Bills—Mr. Speaker explains the course of procedure directed in respect of a Private Bill which has been extensively altered by the Select Committee to which it was referred. It has been held that the Amendments made to a Private Bill by a Select Committee ought not to be so extensive as to constitute a different Bill from that which has been read a second time by the House; and Mr. Speaker applies this rule to the case of the *Toll Bridges* (*River Thames*) *Bill*—which is a hybrid Bill, [230] 1679

Select Committees—Nomination—It is competent to an hon. Member to move the omission of any name from the list, but not to substitute the name of another Member in his stead without notice.—*Referees on Private Bills*, [227] 1496

Supply—By Order of the House of last Session (1875) Supply is to stand as first Order of the Day on Fridays; whereas the Secretary to the Treasury had put down a Money Bill as first Order for Friday, 24th March. Mr. Speaker explains that there are occasions on which such a course has been taken—especially in the case of Money Bills which are urgently required, and which are not calculated to interfere with the progress of Public Business.—*Consolidated Fund Bill*, [228] 564

Supply—Amendment on Motion for Committee of Supply—The House having affirmed the Question, "That I do now leave the Chair," it is incompetent to move an Amendment, [227] 1771; [229] 1622

Or Resolution, [227] 1820

SPENCER, Earl
Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 637
Cattle Disease (Ireland), 2R. [231] 668
Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. [231] 935

SPINKS, Mr. Serjeant F. L., *Oldham*
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 1288
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1586, 1601
Roumania—New Tariff, [230] 852

STACPOOLE, Captain W., *Ennis*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Court Martial on Captain Roberts, [230] 1961; [231] 414
  Veterinary Department, [230] 1474
  Veterinary Surgeons, [227] 1864; [228] 619, 1830
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 729
Civil Service (Ireland), [228] 1099
Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1049
Electoral County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [227] 783, 787
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 306
Land, Owners of (Ireland)—"Domesday Book," [227] 1208
Law and Justice—Wilberforce, Mr., Case of, Res. [228] 2022
Merchant Shipping Acts—Unseaworthy Ships, [228] 472
Navy—Naval Officers holding Civil Appointments, [228] 1829; [229] 37
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1098
Parliamentary Boroughs (Ireland), [228] 1906
Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868 — Boston Election, [228] 1480
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. [228] 1471
Poor Law Rating (Ireland), 2R. [229] 2024
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 332
Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [227] 993
  Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [227] 1841

STANHOPE, Earl
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), 2R. [229] 481, 486

STANHOPE, Hon. E., *Lincolnshire, Mid*
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [227] 447; Comm. *cl.* 3, [228] 547

STANHOPE, Mr. W. T. W. S., *Yorkshire, W.R.*
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 5, [230] 1301
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 888
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) (No. 2), 2R. [228] 1888
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 15; [228] 1618; *cl.* 19, 1883
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 13, [230] 103

STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, Lord
Africa, West Coast of—Exchange of Territory, [227] 393
Barbadoes, [231] 250
Cattle Diseases (England and Ireland)—Privy Council Regulations, [227] 126
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [229] 1032
Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 814; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 937; *add. cl.* 945, 946
Fugitive Slaves—Coolies, [228] 254
Gas Light and Coke Company, 2R. [230] 232
India—Sirdar Narain Singh, Petition of, [229] 772

[*cont.*

STANLEY of ALDERLEY, Lord—*cont.*
  Languages (India)—Indian Civil Service, [230] 1465
  Malay Peninsula, Address for Papers, [227] 1000, 1013, 1018; Personal Explanation, 1283; Res. [230] 824, 846
  Mauritius, Coolie Traffic in the—The Royal Commission, [229] 481
  Primary Education, Motion for Returns, [229] 98
  Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 850
  Slave Trade, 1R. [230] 239; 2R. 735; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 848; 3R. Protest against, [231] 1235
  Turkey—Treaties of 1876, Res. [231] 102

STANLEY, Hon. Captain F. A. (Financial Secretary for War) *Lancashire, N.*
  Army—Miscellaneous Questions
    Guards, Brigade of, Special Allowances to the, [229] 1990
    Militia Adjutants, [227] 1768, 1771
    Militia Quartermasters — Pensions, [227] 1236
    Mobilization Scheme, The New, [230] 373
  Army Corps Training, 2R. [229] 1752
  Army Estimates—War Office, [229] 1658
    Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, [227] 1776
  Army Purchase Estimate—Army Purchase Commission, [229] 2023

STANSFELD, Right Hon. J., *Halifax*
  Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [230] 1580
  Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 849, 850, 851
  Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1014
  Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [229] 1767; Consid. [230] 482
  Valuation of Property, Leave, [227] 250
  Vivisection — Royal Commission, Report of, [227] 819

STANTON, Mr. A. J., *Stroud*
  Commons, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [229] 1523; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1527

STARKIE, Mr. J. P. C., *Lancashire, N.E.*
  Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 354

Statute Law—Acts of Parliament—Report of Select Committee of 1875
  Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 24, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, effect should be given to the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1875 upon Acts of Parliament" (*Mr. Gregory*) *v.*, [228] 568; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to

Statute Law Revision (Substituted Enactments) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 11 (No. 82)
  Read 2ª* *May* 15
  Committee* *May* 22
  Report* *May* 23
  Read 3ª* *May* 26
c. Read 1°* *June* 1 [Bill 183]
  Read 2°* *June* 15
  Committee*; Report *June* 16
  Read 3°* *June* 19
l. Royal Assent *June* 27 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 20]

STEVENSON, Mr. J. C., *South Shields*
  Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 478, 545
  Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 16, [228] 1796; *add. cl.* [229] 68
  Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1878; 3R. [231] 561

STEWART, Mr. M. J., *Wigton Bo.*
  China — Yunnan Mission—The Report, [231] 117
  China, Res. [230] 558
  Church Bodies (Gibraltar)—The Ordinances, Motion for an Address, [228] 769
  Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 34
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2057
  Elementary Education, 2R. [229] 1957; Comm. *cl.* 7, [230] 1417
  Fugitive Slaves, Reception of, [227] 819
  Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1640
  Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [230] 1383
  Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 998
  Poor Law (Scotland), Comm. [230] 513
  Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [228] 1811
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1350
  Slave Trade (East Africa), Res. [228] 1220

STORER, Mr. G., *Nottinghamshire, S.*
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2066
  Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 965; Comm. [230] 1283; *cl.* 4, 1292; *cl.* 14, 1455; *cl.* 26, 1505; *cl.* 34, 1512; *add. cl.* 1849
  Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1642
  Inland Revenue—Malt Tax, [229] 1973, 1974
  Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1031, 1032
  Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [229] 1862
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1344
  Supply—Constabulary, Ireland, [228] 593
    Public Works in Ireland, [227] 1845

STRATHNAIRN, Lord
  Army—The Reserves, Address for Papers, [231] 670, 687

STUART, Colonel J. F. D. C., *Cardiff*
  Elementary Education Act—Cardiff School Board, [228] 171

Suez Canal Shares Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
  Ordered; read 1º * *June* 12 [Bill 189]
  Read 2º * *August* 5
  Committee; Report, after debate *August* 8, [231] 831
  Read 3º * *August* 9
  Personal Explanation, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 9, 877
  Read 1ª * (*Earl of Derby*) *August* 10 (No. 221)
  Read 2ª * *August* 11
  Committee *; Report *August* 12
  Read 3ª * *August* 14
  Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 67]

Suez Canal, The—See title *Egypt*

Sugar Convention, 1864—*Holland*
  Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 21, [227] 562

Sugar Convention, 1875—*France*
  Refusal of the Dutch Chamber, Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 16, [228] 73; Question, Observations, Lord Hampton; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 24, 557; Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 10, 1478
  Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 30, [230] 737
    International Sugar Convention—Correspondence . . . . . . [1527]
    Sugar Industry (Foreign Countries) [1485]

SULLIVAN, Mr. A. M., *Louth Co.*
  Army—Army Mobilization—Roman Catholic Militiamen, [230] 1628
    War Department Contracts, [228] 619
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, [227] 1274
  British Museum—Reading Rooms, [228] 1476
  Cattle Disease (Ireland), 2R. [227] 1778; Comm. *cl.* 2, [228] 1037
  Church Bodies (Gibraltar)—The Ordinances, Motion for an Address, [228] 769
  Consolidated Fund, 3R. [227] 1438
  Criminal Law—Margaret M'Fadden, Case of, [228] 68
  Elementary Education, Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 477, 484
  Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 896, 897
  Germany—Prince Bismarck and Count Arnim, [228] 875
  Henwood, Mr. C., Petition of, Res. [228] 344
  Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whisky, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1209
  Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Education Board—The Staff, [230] 950
    Intemperance, [227] 1865
    Irish Fisheries Act—Licences, [228] 695
    Licensing Act, 1872 — Publicans' Signboards, [228] 561
    Public Houses, [227] 1121
    Sunday Drinking—Return, [227] 1418

[*cont.*

SULLIVAN, Mr. A. M.—*cont.*
  Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 815
  Ireland—National School Teachers Act, 1875, Res. [228] 239
  Ireland—Peace Preservation Act, Res. [228] 1237
  Ireland—Public Houses—Sunday Closing, Res. [229] 549
  Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [228] 819
  Merchant Shipping, Comm. [228] 525, 538; *cl.* 3, 549, 551, 639, 681, 898, 908; *cl.* 10, 1371; *cl.* 14, 1376; Consid. *cl.* 20, [229] 1079
  Monastic and Conventual Institutions (Great Britain), Res. [228] 1027
  National Museum and Institute of Science and Art for Ireland, [230] 1808
  Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [230] 470
  Parliament—Leitrim County Election—Captain O'Beirne, [230] 180, 181
    Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1638, 1639
  Parliament — Public Petition from a Foreign Town — Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1418
  Parliament—Referees on Private Bills—Nomination of Select Committee, Amendt. [227] 1495, 1496
  Post Office Telegraphs—Glengarriffe, [228] 1180
  Queen's Visit to Germany, [228] 701
  Royal Titles, Comm. [228] 135; *cl.* 1, 328
  Supply—Chief Secretary for Ireland Offices, [227] 1843
    Civil Contingencies Fund, [228] 340
    Constabulary, Ireland, [228] 594
    Public Buildings (Ireland), [228] 252
    Public Works in Ireland, Amendt. [227] 1843
    Stationery and Printing, [227] 990
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 357, 359

Sulphurous Acid, &c.
  Moved, that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the working and management of works and manufactories from which sulphurous acid, sulphuretted hydrogen, and ammoniacal or other vapours and gases are given off, to ascertain the effect produced thereby on animal and vegetable life, and to report on the means to be adopted for the prevention of injury thereto arising from the exhalation of such acids, vapours, and gases, and upon the legislative measures required for this purpose (*The Duke of Northumberland*) *Mar* 27, [228] 600; after short debate, words "and upon the legislative measures required for this purpose" withdrawn; Motion, as amended, agreed to
  Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *April* 27, 1745

Sunday Trading—The Bakers Act
  Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 16, [228] 62

Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates) Bill
Formerly—
Civil Servants Superannuation (Unhealthy Climates) Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 20 [Bill 263]
Read 2° * *July* 24
Committee *; Report *July* 27
Read 3° * *July* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *July* 31 (No. 199)
Read 2ª * *August* 7
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 53]

SUPPLY

227] *Army Estimates—The Increased Pay of the Soldiers*, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 3, 1295

. *Local Finance—Annual Statement*, Question, Mr. Paget; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 29, 1122

Resolved, That this House will, upon Friday, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty *Feb* 9

. Considered in Committee *Feb* 14, 266—£4,080,000, SUEZ CANAL SHARES—After debate, debate adjourned—Committee—R.P.

. Considered in Committee *Feb* 18, 500—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS

. Resolutions reported *Feb* 23, 789

. Postponed Resolutions considered, and further postponed *Feb* 25, 995
Res. 4, 9, 10 postponed

. Considered in Committee *Feb* 21, 562—£4,080,000, SUEZ CANAL SHARES—Question again proposed—Resolution reported *Feb* 22

. Considered in Committee *Feb* 25, 990—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS — Resolutions reported *Feb* 28

. *The Civil Service Commission, Appointment of Lord Hampton*, Observations, Mr. Mundella *Feb* 28, 1099

. Postponed Resolutions [*Feb* 23] further considered *Feb* 28, 1099

Res. 10. "That a sum, not exceeding £22,893, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1877, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Civil Service Commission"

Amendt. to leave out "£22,893," and insert "£22,393" (*Mr. Mundella*) *v.*; after short debate, Question put, "That '£22,893,' &c.;" A. 159, N. 126; M. 33

. Considered in Committee *Mar* 2, 1236—ARMY ESTIMATES—Departmental Statement of the Secretary of State for War in moving the Army Estimates—Committee—R.P.

[*cont.*

SUPPLY—*cont.*

227] Considered in Committee *Mar* 6, 1456—ARMY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *Mar* 9—Committee—R.P.

. Considered in Committee *Mar* 9, 1775—ARMY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *Mar* 10

. Considered in Committee *Mar* 10, 1839—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS—Resolutions reported *Mar* 13

. Considered in Committee *Mar* 13, 1918—NAVY ESTIMATES—Departmental Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty in moving the Navy Estimates—60,000 Men and Boys (including 14,000 Marines)—Resolution reported *Mar* 14

228] Considered in Committee *Mar* 17, 250—CIVIL SERVICES (EXCESSES, 1874-5)—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1875-6 (DEFICIENCIES)—CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1875-6—CLASSES I., II., III.—Committee—R.P.—Resolutions reported *Mar* 20

. Considered in Committee *Mar* 20, 337—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1875-6—CLASSES III., V., VI., VII.—INLAND REVENUE—POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE—£500,000, WAR OFFICE, on account of INDIA—NAVY EXCESSES, 1874-5—GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND SCHOOL (Excess of Expenditure)—Resolutions reported *Mar* 21

. Considered in Committee *Mar* 24, 591—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE—Resolutions reported *Mar* 27

. Considered in Committee *April* 7, 1466—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES—£1,254,650 CIVIL SERVICES (ON ACCOUNT) 1876-7—Resolutions reported *April* 10

. Considered in Committee *April* 10, 1528—NAVY ESTIMATES—Committee—R.P.—Resolutions reported *April* 11

. Considered in Committee *April* 28, 1879—£1,370,000, on account, REVENUE DEPARTMENTS—£100,000 on account ARMY PURCHASE COMMISSION—Resolutions reported *May* 1

229] Considered in Committee *May* 8, 255—NAVY ESTIMATES—Resolution reported *May* 9—Committee—R.P.

. Considered in Committee *May* 26, 1309—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS III.—Vote 3—THE OFFICIAL REFEREES—Resolution reported *May* 29

. Considered in Committee *June* 8, 1583—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS I.—Resolutions reported *June* 12

. Considered in Committee *June* 9, 1636—ARMY ESTIMATES—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES—CLASS VI.—SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES—CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS—REVENUE DEPARTMENTS—Resolutions reported *June* 12, 1756

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

229] Considered in Committee *June* 16, 2019—Navy Estimates—Army Purchase Commission—Resolution reported *June* 19

230] Considered in Committee *June* 26, 456—Navy Estimates—Greenwich Hospital and Schools—Resolutions reported *June* 27

. Considered in Committee *June* 30, 822—Civil Services (£436,410 Further on Account)—Resolution reported *July* 3, and, after debate, agreed to

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

231] Considered in Committee *August* 1, 260—Civil Service Estimates—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art—Resolutions reported *August* 14

. Considered in Committee *August* 5, 655—(Mr. Cave's Mission) Suez Canal Directors (Supplementary) — Civil Service Estimates—Civil Service Estimates—Class V. (Supplementary) — Resolutions reported *August* 7, and, after debate, agreed to 746

SUMMARY.

Appropriation of Grants.

		£	*s.*	*d.*
Deficiencies, 1874-5		265,559	5	1
Supplementary, 1875-6		4,843,991	0	0
1876-7.				
Navy Services		11,288,872	0	0
Army Services		15,281,600	0	0
Charges defrayed by War Office on account of India		170,000	0	0
Army Purchase Commission ...		464,200	0	0
Civil Services—viz.:	£			
I. Public Works and Buildings	1,417,113			
II. Salaries, &c. Public Departments...	2,569,902			
III. Law and Justice	4,944,613			
IV. Education, Science, and Art ...	3,290,039			
V. Colonial and Consular Services ...	579,719			
VI. Superannuation, &c.	558,068			
VII. Miscellaneous	62,847			
		13,422,301	0	0
Revenue Departments, &c. ...		7,930,318	0	0
Advances for Greenwich Hospital and School...		145,752	0	0
Total ...		£53,812,593	5	1

SUMMARY.

Ways and Means.

Grants out of the Consolidated Fund.

	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
For the service of the years ending 31st March 1875 and 1876;						
Under Act 39 Vic. cap. 2				4,080,000	0	0
Under Act 39 Vic. cap. 4				1,029,550	5	1
For the service of the year ending 31st March 1877; viz.						
Under Act 39 Vic. cap. 4	9,000,000	0	0			
Under Act 39 Vic. cap. 15	11,000,000	0	0			
Uuder this Act ...	28,703,043	0	0			
				48,703,043	0	0
Total ...				£53,812,593	5	1

DEFICIENCIES 1874-5.

Committee *Mar* 20—Report *Mar* 21	Total of Vote. £	*s.*	*d.*
Navy	238,255	4	6

After short debate, Vote agreed to [228] 341

Committee *Mar* 17—Report *Mar* 20 Civil Services, viz., Class I.	£	*s.*	*d.*
Royal Palaces	23	13	1
Public Buildings	2,460	12	2
Furniture of Public Offices ...	6	17	1
Houses of Parliament (Buildings)...	372	3	5
National Gallery, Enlargement ...	1,864	5	4
Portland Harbour	24	10	0
Lighthouses Abroad	1,763	7	9

[*cont.*

Class II.	Total of Vote. £	*s.*	*d.*
Home Office	73	1	8
Privy Seal Office	12	0	4
Registrars of Friendly Societies ...	162	15	4
Public Works Loan Commission and West India Islands Relief Commission	19	4	7
Stationery Office and Printing ...	4,110	8	1
Exchequer and other Offices in Scotland	9	19	10
Fishery Board, Scotland ...	27	19	0
Register Office, General, Scotland	111	11	11
Household of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland	59	7	8

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote. £	s.	d.
CLASS III.			
Police, Counties and Boroughs, Great Britain	1,349	6	5
Convict Establishments in England and the Colonies	924	10	6
Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland	3,830	10	4
CLASS IV.			
University of London	13	19	10
CLASS V.			
Diplomatic Services	3,172	5	11
Consular Services	645	0	5
CLASS VI.			
Relief of Distressed British Seamen Abroad	2,185	16	1
CLASS VII.			
Deep Sea Exploring Expedition ...	361	14	11
Total Civil Services Deficiencies	23,585	1	8
COMMITTEE *Mar* 20—REPORT *Mar* 21			
GREENWICH HOSPITAL and SCHOOL	3,718	18	11
Total of Vote ...	£265,559	5	1

SUPPLEMENTARY 1875-6.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 20—REPORT *Mar* 21

	£
ARMY, viz.:	
Charges defrayed by War Office on account of India [228] 340	500,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
ASHANTEE EXPEDITION:—	
Towards defraying the expense of the expedition into Ashantee ...	3,200
CIVIL SERVICES, viz.:	
CLASS I.	
COMMITTEE *Mar* 17—REPORT *Mar* 20	
Royal Palaces	
Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £4,750, be granted, &c."	
Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Fawcett*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [228] 251	4,750
Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland ...	18,944
After short debate, Vote agreed to [228] 252	
National Gallery, Enlargement ...	1,233
Ramsgate Harbour	1,500
Chapter House, Westminster ...	250
Public Offices Site	36,920
Public Buildings, Ireland [228] 252	4,200
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
British Embassy Houses and Consular and Legation Buildings	2,762

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote. £
CLASS II.	
Home Office	1,200
Colonial Office	1,450
Charity Commission	1,200
Friendly Societies Registry ...	1,124
Public Works Loan Commission, &c. ...	329
Stationery Office and Printing ...	27,900
Office of Public Works, Ireland ...	600
Register Office, General, Ireland ...	2,055
Pauper Lunatics, Ireland	1,256
CLASS III.	
Law Charges, England	
Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £5,250, be granted, &c.;" Committee—R.P.	
COMMITTEE *Mar* 20—REPORT *Mar* 21	
Law Charges, England	5,250
Vote agreed to	
Criminal Prosecutions, &c.... ...	5,000
Police, Counties and Boroughs, Great Britain ... ... [228] 337	60,752
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
Convict Establishments in England and the Colonies	800
Registry of Deeds, Ireland ...	376
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum, Ireland	369
CLASS V.	
Diplomatic Services	32,800
Grants in Aid of Expenditure in certain Colonies	500
Tonnage Bounties, &c.	3,000
CLASS VI.	
Superannuations, &c.	5,000
CLASS VII.	
Ashantee Expedition, Gratuities and Prize Pay	9,330
Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company ... [228] 337	6,249
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
Repayments to the Civil Contingencies Fund	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £8,192, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £8,067, &c." (*Captain Nolan*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [228] 338	8,192
Total Civil Services Supplementary	245,291
COMMITTEE *Feb* 14, 21—REPORT *Feb* 22	
Purchase Money of the Shares which belonged to the Khedive of Egypt in the Suez Canal, and Expenses attendant thereon	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,080,000, be granted, &c.;" after debate, Debate adjourned [227] 266	
Comm. Feb 21—After further debate, Vote agreed to [227] 562	4,080,000

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, &c. £

COMMITTEE *Mar* 20—REPORT *Mar* 21

Inland Revenue	6,500
Post Office Packet Service... ...	9,000
Total of Vote ...	£4,843,991

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1876-7.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 13—REPORT *Mar* 14

Departmental Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty (*Mr. Hunt*) in moving the Navy Estimates

Moved, "That 60,000 Men and Boys be employed for the Sea and Coastguard Service for the year ending the 31st March, 1877, including 14,000 Royal Marines" [227] 1918 — *Numbers.* 60,000

After long debate, Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Rylands*); A. 63; N. 105; M. 42

Moved, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair" (*Captain Nolan*); after short debate, A. 62, N. 104; M. 42; Vote agreed to

Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Motion agreed to; Committee—R.P.

Total of Vote. £

COMMITTEE *April* 10—REPORT *April* 11

(1.) Wages to Seamen and Marines... 2,634,904
After debate, Vote agreed to [228] 1528

(2.) Victuals and Clothing for ditto... 1,153,367
After short debate, Vote agreed to [228] 1549

(3.) Admiralty Office [228] 1549 — 189,820
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(4.) Coast Guard Service, Royal Naval Reserve, &c.
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £210,230, be granted, &c."
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Rylands*); after short debate, Motion agreed to; Committee—R.P.

COMMITTEE *May* 8—REPORT *May* 9

£210,230, Coast Guard Service, &c.; after short debate, Vote agreed to ... ... [229] 255 — 210,230

(5.) Scientific Branch
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £109,194, be granted, &c."
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Rylands*); Motion agreed to; Committee—R.P.

COMMITTEE *June* 16—REPORT *June* 19

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £109,194, be granted, &c."
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Rylands*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Original Motion withdrawn [229] 2019

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote £

COMMITTEE *June* 26—REPORT *June* 27

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £109,194, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That Sub-head £38,051, Royal Naval College, Greenwich, be reduced £2,000" (*Mr. Rylands*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [230] 456 — 109,194

(6.) Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,323,750, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,073,750, &c." (*Mr. Rylands*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [230] 462 — 1,323,750

(7.) Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad 76,400

(8.) Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad 65,830

(9.) Marine Divisions 20,053

(10.) Naval Stores for the Building, Repair, and Outfit of the Fleet and Coast Guard, Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract:

Section I. Naval Stores ... 1,261,320

Section II. Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... [230] 472 — 1,353,600

(11.) New Works, Buildings, Machinery, and Repairs 569,249

(12.) Medicines and Medical Stores ... 76,230

(13.) Martial Law and Law Charges ... 15,114

(14.) Miscellaneous Services
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £135,547, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £135,147, &c." (*Mr. Hanbury Tracy*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [230] 473 — 135,547

Total for the Effective Service ... 9,194,608

(15.) Half Pay, Reserved Half Pay, and Retired Pay to Officers of the Navy and Royal Marines [230] 475 — 888,472
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(16.) Military and Civil Pensions and Allowances:

Section I. Military Pensions and Allowances 726,136

Section II. Civil Pensions and Allowances 282,176

Total for the Naval Service ...11,091,392

FOR THE SERVICE OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT.

(17.) Army Department (Conveyance of Troops) 197,480

Total NAVY ESTIMATES ...£11,288,872

[*cont.*

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1876-7.

Committee *Mar* 2

Departmental Statement of the Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) in moving the Army Estimates

Moved, "That a number of Land Forces not exceeding 132,884 be maintained for the Service, &c. from the 1st day of April 1876, to the 31st day of March 1877" [227] 1236

Amendt. Moved, "That a number of Land Forces not exceeding 122,884, &c." (*Mr. Pease*)

After debate, moved to report Progress (*Mr. Holms*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Committee—R.P.

Committee *Mar* 6

Question and Amendt. again proposed; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Vote agreed to, 1456

Resolution reported *Mar* 9

Numbers.	*Numbers*
(A.) Total number of Men, exclusive of the Staff of Brigade Depôts to be formed from permanent Staff of Auxiliary Forces	129,693
Staff of Brigade Depôts to be formed from Staff of Auxiliary Forces ...	3,191
Total number of Men upon the Home and Colonial Establishment, exclusive of India — ...	132,884

I. Regular Forces.	Total of Vote.
	£
(1.) Pay of the General Staff, Regimental Pay and Allowances, and other Charges	4,722,200
After short debate, Vote agreed to [227] 1486	
(2.) Divine Service	49,200
(3.) Administration of Military Law	27,900
(4.) Medical Establishments and Services ... [227] 1488	262,400
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
II. Auxiliary and Reserve Forces.	
(5.) Militia Pay and Allowances	
After short debate, Committee—R.P. [227] 1488	
Committee *Mar* 9—Report *Mar* 10	
Militia Pay and Allowances; after short debate, Vote agreed to [227] 1775	672,700
(6.) Yeomanry Cavalry, Pay and Allowances ... [227] 1776	74,400
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(7.) Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances ... [227] 1777	458,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(8.) Army Reserve Force Pay and allowances (including Enrolled Pensioners) ... [227] 1777	132,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote.
Committee *June* 9—Report *June* 12	£
III.—Commissariat and Ordnance Store Establishments, &c.	
(9.) Commissariat and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. ...	370,400
(10.) Provisions, Forage, Fuel, Transport, and other Services ...	2,997,000
(11.) Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies	800,600
(12.) Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike and other Stores	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,229,000, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,143,146, be granted, &c." (*Sir W. Barttelot*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [229] 1636	1,229,000
IV.—Works and Buildings.	
(13.) Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for, Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad [229] 1647	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £845,100, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That the Item of £17,000 for Hyde Park Cavalry Barracks be omitted, &c." (*Mr. R. Yorke*); after short debate, A. 14, N. 125; M. 111; after further short debate, Vote agreed to	845,100
V.—Various Services.	
(14.) Establishments for Military Education ... [229] 1654	144,100
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(15.) Miscellaneous Services [229] 1657	36,600
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(16.) Administration of the Army ...	214,700
After short debate, Vote agreed to [229] 1658	
Total Effective Services	£13,036,300
VI.—Non-Effective Services.	
(17.) Rewards for Distinguished Services, &c.	35,500
(18.) Pay of General Officers ...	89,000
(19.) Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers and Half-pay [229] 1658	505,800
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(20.) Widows' Pensions, &c. ...	144,600
(21.) Pensions for Wounds	16,500
(22.) Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (In-Pensions)	35,400
(23.) Out-Pensions [229] 1659	1,220,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(24.) Superannuation Allowances ...	164,200
(25.) Militia, Yeomanry, Cavalry, and Volunteer Corps	34,300
Losses Written off as Irrecoverable	—
Total Non-Effective Services	£2,245,300

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
Total Effective and Non-Effective Services	£15,281,600
Total Amount of Estimate, 1876-7	15,281,600
Deduct estimated Exchequer Extra Receipts	1,292,100
Net Charge for Army Services, 1876-77	£13,989,500

Committee *Aug* 5—Report *Aug* 7

Charges defrayed by War Office on Account of India	£170,000

Committee *June* 16—Report *June* 19

†£364,200 Army Purchase Commission	£464,200
After short debate, Vote agreed to [229] 2022	

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1876-77.

⁂ The Votes marked † are "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

Committee *June* 8—Report *June* 9	Total of Vote.
Great Britain:	£
(1.) † £26,303, Royal Palaces ...	32,303
(2.) † £95,105, Royal Parks	114,105
After short debate, Vote agreed to [229] 1583	
(3.) † £112,938, Public Buildings	135,938
(4.) † £13,440, Furniture of Public Offices	16,240
(5.) † £25,569, Houses of Parliament	31,069
After short debate, Vote agreed to [229] 1584	
(6.) † £4,360, New Home and Colonial Offices ... [229] 1587	5,360
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(7.) † £9,506, Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland ... [229] 1587	11,506
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(8.) † £2,084, National Gallery Enlargement ... [229] 1588	2,584
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(9) † £143,718, Post Office and Inland Revenue Buildings	173,718
(10.) † £11,573, British Museum Buildings	14,073
(11.) † £46,050, County Courts ...	56,050
(12.) † £4,043, Science and Art Department Buildings	4,843
(13.) † £105,500, Surveys of the United Kingdom ... [229] 1589	132,500
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(14.) † £7,405, Harbours of Refuge	8,905
(15.) † £7,500, Metropolitan Fire Brigade	10,000
(16.) † £194,991, Rates on Government Property	233,991

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
(17.) † £951, Wellington Monument	£
After short debate, Vote agreed to [229] 1590	1,151
(18.) † £65,000, Natural History Museum ... [229] 1590	80,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(19.) † £4,644, Metropolitan Police Courts ... [229] 1591	5,644
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(20.) † £65,325, New Courts of Justice, &c. ... [229] 1591	80,325
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(21.) † £1,951, Ramsgate Harbour ...	2,351
(22.) † £2,100, New Palace at Westminster—Acquisition of Lands, &c.	2,600
After short debate, Vote agreed to [229] 1594	

Committee *Aug* 5—Report *Aug* 7

Ireland:

(23.) † £129,922, Public Buildings ...	174,922

Committee *June* 8—Report *June* 9

Abroad:

(24.) † £12,960, Lighthouses Abroad	15,660
(25.) † £37,330, Embassy Houses and Consular Buildings	45,330
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £37,330, be granted, &c."	
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Sir H. Drummond Wolff*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [230] 1594	
Total ...	£1,391,168

Supplementary 1876-7.

Committee *Aug* 5—Report *Aug* 7

(12.) Science and Art Department Buildings	3,500
(19.) Metropolitan Police Courts ...	15,000
(22A.) Burlington House	2,545
(22B.) Edinburgh Arboretum ...	4,900
Total Civil Services, Class I. ...	£1,417,113

Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments.

England:

Committee *Feb* 18—Report *Feb* 23	£
(1.) House of Lords Offices ...	43,489
(2.) House of Commons Offices ...	50,006
(3.) Treasury and Subordinate Departments	58,010
(4.) Home Office and Subordinate Departments	90,178
(5.) Foreign Office	63,196
(6.) Colonial Office	34,755

Committee *Aug* 5—Report *Aug* 7

(7.) † £27,493, Privy Council Office and Subordinate Departments ...	37,243

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote.

COMMITTEE *Feb* 18—REPORT *Feb* 23 — £

(8.) Board of Trade and Subordinate Departments 145,958
(9.) Privy Seal Office
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,773, be granted, &c.;" after short debate, A. 145, N. 50; M. 95; Vote agreed to [227] 501 — 2,773
(10.) Charity Commission for England and Wales... ... [227] 504 — 33,500
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(11.) Civil Service Commission
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £22,893, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £21,193, &c." (*Mr. Macdonald*); after debate, A. 62, N. 87; M. 25; original Question again proposed
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £22,393, &c." (*Mr. Mundella*); after short debate, A. 63, N. 79; M. 16; after further debate, Vote agreed to [227] 506 — 22,893
(12.) Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission ... [227] 515 — 18,619
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(13.) Inclosure and Drainage Acts Expenses 8,600
(14.) Comptroller and Auditor General Department 46,065
(15.) Registry of Friendly Societies ... 4,496
After short debate, Vote agreed to [227] 515
(16.) Local Government Board
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £693,287, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £692,287, &c." (*Mr. Meldon*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [227] 515 — 693,287

Resolutions reported *Feb* 23; Resolutions 4, 9, 10, 14, postponed
Postponed Resolutions considered *Feb* 25; Resolutions 4, 9 agreed to, after debate [227] 995; Resolution 10 further postponed
Resolution 10 further considered *Feb* 28, and, after debate, agreed to [227] 1099
Resolution 14 agreed to

(17.) Lunacy Commission 15,026
(18.) Mint 50,250
(19.) National Debt Office ... 17,334

COMMITTEE *Feb* 25—REPORT *Feb* 28

(20.) Patent Office 23,875
(21.) Paymaster General's Office ... 23,651
(22.) Public Record Office ... 22,509
(23.) Public Works Loan Commission 9,600
(24.) Registrar General of Births, &c. 45,911
(25.) Stationery Office and Printing ... 489,635
(26.) Woods, Forests, &c., Office of ... 26,284
(27.) Works and Public Buildings, Office of 38,865
(28.) Secret Service 24,000

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote.

SCOTLAND: — £

(29.) Exchequer and other Offices
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 6,225
[227] 990
(30.) Fishery Board
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £12,672, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £8,850, &c." (*Sir William Cuninghame*); Amendt. negatived
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £12,322, &c." (*Mr. J. Barclay*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Vote agreed to [227] 990 — 12,672
(31.) Board of Lunacy [227] 994 — 5,705
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(32.) Registrar General of Births, &c. 6,665
(33.) Board of Supervision ... 82,783

IRELAND:

COMMITTEE *Mar* 10—REPORT *Mar* 13

(34.) Lord Lieutenant's Household
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,992, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,430, &c." (*Mr. J. Cowen*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [227] 1839 — 6,992
(35.) Chief Secretary's Office ... 27,530
After short debate, Vote agreed to [227] 1843
(36.) Boundary Survey 460
(37.) Charitable Donations and Bequests Office 2,058

COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7

(38.) † £93,292, Local Government Board 126,292
(39.) Public Record Office 6,050

COMMITTEE *Mar* 10—REPORT *Mar* 13

(40.) Public Works Office
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £28,675, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £27,836, &c." (*Mr. Sullivan*); after short debate, A. 78, N. 123; M. 45
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £28,175, &c." (*Mr. Muntz*); A. 81, N. 123; M. 42; Vote agreed to ... 28,675
[227] 1843
(41.) Registrar General of Births, &c. 18,237
(42.) General Valuation 21,550
(43.) Pauper Lunatics 78,000

Total Civil Services, Class II. ...£2,569,902

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 10—REPORT *Mar* 13

ENGLAND: — £

(1.) Law Charges 57,061
(2.) Criminal Prosecutions ... 179,848
After short debate, Vote agreed to [227] 1847

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(3.) Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £173,025 be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £171,325, &c." (*Mr. Waddy*); after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn [227] 1847	
Comm. May 26, That a sum, not exceeding £144,025, &c. to complete, &c.; Moved that a sum, not exceeding £142,325, &c. (*Mr. Waddy*); after debate, Amendt. negatived; Vote agreed to [229] 1309	173,025
Report May 29	
(4.) Common Law Division	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £61,586, be granted, &c.;" Committee—R.P.	
COMMITTEE *Mar* 24—REPORT *Mar* 27	
Common Law Division	61,586
(5.) Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division	92,041
(6.) Admiralty Registrar	12,284
(7.) London Bankruptcy Court ...	48,585
(8.) County Courts	414,426
(9.) Office of Land Registry ...	5,414
(10.) Police Courts (London and Sheerness)	14,240
(11.) Metropolitan Police	433,374
After short debate, Vote agreed to [228] 591	
(12.) Police in Counties and Boroughs	808,098
After short debate, Vote agreed to [228] 591	
(13.) Convict Establishments	440,745
After short debate, Vote agreed to [228] 592	
(14.) County and Borough Prisons ...	101,187
(15.) Reformatory and Industrial Schools	230,547
(16.) Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	29,484
(17.) Miscellaneous Legal Charges ...	18,690
SCOTLAND:	
(18.) Criminal Proceedings ...	69,389
(19.) Law and Justice	59,527
(20.) General Register House, Edinburgh	32,389
(21.) Prisons and Judicial Statistics	24,189
IRELAND:	
(22.) Criminal Prosecutions and Law Charges	80,453
(23.) Court of Chancery	42,196
(24.) Courts of Common Law ...	28,901
(25.) Court of Bankruptcy ...	9,619
(26.) Landed Estates Court ...	12,283
(27.) Court of Probate	11,530
(28.) Admiralty Court Registry ...	1,700
(29.) Registry of Deeds	18,460
(30.) Registration of Judgments ...	3,060
(31.) Metropolitan Police, Dublin ...	136,975
(32.) Constabulary Force [228] 593	1,086,168
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(33.) Government Prisons	40,540
(34.) County and Borough Prisons and Reformatories	90,768
(35.) Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	6,165
(36.) Miscellaneous Legal Charges ...	69,666
Resolutions reported *Mar* 27	
Resolution 11—after short debate, Resolution agreed to [228] 687	
Resolution 23—after short debate, A. 192, N. 18; M. 174	
Other Resolutions agreed to	
Total Civil Services, Class III. ...	£4,944,613

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

COMMITTEE *Aug* 1—REPORT *Aug* 4

GREAT BRITAIN:	£
(1.) † £1,107,055, Public Education	1,707,055
After short debate, Vote agreed to [231] 260	
(2.) † £222,673, Science and Art Department ... [231] 263	297,673
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(3.) † £80,447, British Museum ...	108,947
After short debate, Vote agreed to [231] 263	
COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7	
(4.) † £5,098, National Gallery ...	6,898
COMMITTEE *Aug* 1—REPORT *Aug* 4	
(5.) † £1,400, National Portrait Gallery ... ... [231] 265	2,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7	
(6.) † £13,400, Learned Societies ...	12,550
After short debate, Vote agreed to [231] 655	
COMMITTEE *Aug* 1—REPORT *Aug* 4	
(7.) † £7,610, University of London	10,310
SCOTLAND:	
(8.) † £288,227, Public Education ...	438,227
After short debate, Vote agreed to [231] 266	
(9.) † £4,207, Board of Education ...	5,707
(10.) † £13,754, Universities, &c. ...	18,554
(11.) † £1,500, National Gallery ...	2,100
IRELAND:	
(12.) † £420,949, Public Education ...	645,949
After short debate, Vote agreed to [231] 269	
(13.) † £430, Commissioners of Education (Endowed Schools) ...	640
(14.) † £1,739, National Gallery ...	2,339
(15.) † £1,731, Royal Irish Academy	2,481
(16.) † £3,587, Queen's University ...	4,787
(17.) † £8,822, Queen's Colleges ...	11,822
Total ...	£3,278,039

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote

SUPPLEMENTARY 1876-7

COMMITTEE *Aug* 1, 3—REPORT *Aug* 4, 7 — £
(2.) Science and Art Department ... 4,000
(4.) National Gallery 5,000
(6.) Learned Societies and Scientific Institutions 3,000
Total Civil Services, Class IV. ... £3,290,039

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES. — £

COMMITTEE *April* 7
(1.) Diplomatic Services
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £218,663, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £204,163, &c." (*Sir H. D. Wolff*); Moved, to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Whitwell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Motion (*Sir H. D. Wolff*) withdrawn; Original Motion withdrawn [228] 1466

COMMITTEE *June* 9
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £181,663, be granted to complete, &c."
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Dr. Cameron*); Motion withdrawn; Original Motion withdrawn [229] 1659

COMMITTEE *August* 5
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £163,163, be granted to complete, &c.;" after short debate, Vote agreed to [231] 656 — 218,663

REPORT *August* 7
Resolution 8—Moved to reduce Vote by £2,000—Salary of British Minister in Peru (*Dr. Cameron*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Resolution agreed to [231] 746

COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7
(2.) † £184,896, Consular Services ... 245,896

COMMITTEE *June* 9—REPORT *June* 12
(3.) † £33,164, Colonies, Grants-in-Aid 40,164
(4.) † £2,590, Orange River Territory and St. Helena 3,190
(5.) † £3,282, Slave Trade, Commissions for Suppression of ... 3,982
(6.) † £12,007, Tonnage Bounties, &c. 14,507
After short debate, Vote agreed to [229] 1660
(7.) † £4,017, Emigration 4,917
(8.) † £1,600, Treasury Chest ... 2,000

COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7
(9.) Mr. Cave's Mission to Egypt ... 2,200
After short debate, Vote agreed to [231] 655
Total ... £535,519

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote.

SUPPLEMENTARY, 1876-7 — £

COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7
(3.) Colonies, Grants in Aid, &c. ... 35,000
(10.) Suez Canal (British Directors) 9,200
Total Civil Services, Class V.... £579,719

CLASS VI. — SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *June* 9—REPORT *June* 12
(1.) † £333,210, Superannuation and Retired Allowances 433,210
(2.) † £28,900, Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c. 34,900
(3.) † £27,000, Relief of Distressed British Seamen Abroad... ... 33,000
[229] 1660
After short debate, Vote agreed to

COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7
(4.) † £13,243, Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland 18,493

COMMITTEE *June* 9—REPORT *June* 12
(5.) † £3,738, Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances, &c., Great Britain ... 4,538

COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7
(6.) † £3,476, Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, Ireland ... 4,826
Total ... £528,967

SUPPLEMENTARY 1876-7.

COMMITTEE *Aug* 5
(7.) Duke of Leeds' Pension Commutation ... ...
Resolution reported *Aug* 7; after debate, agreed to [231] 755 — 29,101
Total Civil Services, Class VI. ... £558,068

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS.
(1.) † £44,901, Temporary Commissions 54,401
(2.) † £2,430, Deep Sea Exploring Expedition 2,930
(3.) † £4,516, Miscellaneous Expenses 5,516
Total Civil Services, Class VII. ... £62,847

[*cont.*

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1876-77.

COMMITTEE *June* 9—REPORT *June* 12

	£
Vote I. † £828,530, For the Salaries and Expenses of the Customs Department	998,530
Vote II. † £1,431,304, For the Salaries and Expenses of the Inland Revenue Department	1,731,304
Vote III. † £2,570,406, For Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Services, the expenses of Post Office Savings Banks, and of Government Annuities and Insurances, and of the Collection of the Post Office Revenue	3,120,406
Vote IV. † £701,930, For the Post Office Packet Service	851,930

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote. £
Vote V. † £928,148, For the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Telegraph Service	1,128,148

SUPPLEMENTARY 1876-7.

COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7

(3.) Post Office	67,000
(5.) Post Office Telegraphs ...	33,000
Total Revenue Departments ...	£7,930,318

COMMITTEE *June* 26—REPORT *June* 27

Advances for Greenwich Hospital and School	£145,752

Supreme Court of Judicature Act (1875) Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Meldon, Mr. Butt, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 44]
2R. [Dropped]

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)

228] *l.* Presented *Mar* 16, 46; after short debate, Bill read 1ᵃ (No. 31)
. Read 2ᵃ, after short debate *April* 6, 1301
229] Committee *May* 5, 96
. Report *May* 16, 763 (No. 74)
Read 3ᵃ * *May* 18
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*) *May* 22 [Bill 161]
. Read 2°, after short debate *June* 12, 1754
230] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 23, 342
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in any Bill intended to constitute a Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland the rules of procedure should be settled and defined in the Act constituting the Court, in the same manner and to the same extent as they have been in the Acts constituting the English Court" (*Mr. Butt*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 244, N. 76; M. 168
Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. O'Connor Power*); Question put; A. 6, N. 210; M. 204
Main Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.;" further Proceeding adjourned
. Proceeding resumed *June* 26, 483
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.
Bill withdrawn * *August* 9

SWANSTON, Mr. A., *Bandon*
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 269
Parliament—Strangers, Exclusion of, [230] 1554
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. [231] 342
Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [231] 279

Sweden, The British Church at Stockholm
Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 10, [228] 1474; Observations, Question, Viscount Enfield (Lord Strafford); Reply, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *June* 15, [229] 1885; Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 31, [231] 121; Observations, Mr. Beresford Hope; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 7, 714

SYKES, Mr. C., *York, E.R.*
Criminal Law—Mad Dogs, [229] 1115
Local Light Dues (Reduction), Comm. [229] 1963
Merchant Shipping, Consid. *add. cl.* [229] 1059

TALBOT, Mr. J. G., *Kent, W.*
Burial Grounds, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1913, 1921, 1922, 1924
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. Amendt. [227] 1363, 1365
Church of England—Halifax Vicarage—Vicar's Rate, [231] 972
Elementary Education, Leave, [229] 962; Comm. *cl.* 6, [230] 1409; *cl.* 11, 1446; Postponed *cl.* 8, 1530; *add. cl.* 1544, 1546; *add. cl.* [231] 63; Schedule 1, 68
Elementary Education Act, 1870 — School Boards, [229] 1520
Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London), [231] 1188
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 371; [230] 1027

[*cont.*

TALBOT, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [229] 900
Parliament—Public Business, [230] 1913
Poor Law (Metropolis)—Charlotte Hammond, Case of, [230] 1628
Prisons, Leave, [229] 1552

TALBOT DE MALAHIDE, Lord
Irish Church Act—Irish National Monuments, [230] 1767

TAYLOR, Right Hon. Colonel T. E., *Dublin Co.*
Duchy of Lancaster and Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, [227] 1796; Res. [229] 1282

TAYLOR, Mr. P. A., *Leicester Bo.*
Barbadoes, Flogging in, [228] 1323
Civil Departments (Employment of Soldiers), Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1997
Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
  George Hill, Execution of, [229] 34
  Political Prisoners, Release of, [229] 1052
  Wife Desertion—George Warrington, Case of, [227] 2011
Cruelty to Animals, Consid. *cl.* 3, [231] 1150
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 8, [229] 1211
Game Laws (Scotland), 2R. [227] 1643
Law and Justice—Wilberforce, Mr. R. G., Case of, [227] 675, 676; Res. [228] 2008, 2016, 2022
Mutiny, [227] 1873; Comm. *cl.* 106, Amendt. [228] 912; Amendt. 913
Navy—Arrest of Seamen — Leave-breaking, [228] 1907
  Naval Discipline Act — Flogging in the Navy, [229] 487
Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. [230] 147, 148, 177
Offences against the Person, Comm. [227] 331; Amendt. 1180; Motion for reporting Progress, [228] 1622, 1623
Parliament—East Suffolk Election, [227] 2009
  Public Business, [227] 1124, 1126; [229] 1554
  Strangers, Exclusion of, [230] 1554
Public Health—Vaccination Act, [231] 819;—Mr. Pearce, Case of, [230] 1883;—Prosecutions, [228] 62
Sunday Trading—Bakers Act, [228] 62
Turkey—Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [231] 732
Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. [227] 1162
Wild Fowl Preservation, 2R. Amendt. [229] 1181

Telegraphs (Money) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Lord John Manners, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Resolution [February 28] reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1º* *Mar* 1 [Bill 90]
Read 2º, after short debate *Mar* 6, [227] 1488
Committee*; Report *Mar* 9
Read 3º* *Mar* 10

[*cont.*

Telegraphs (Money) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *Mar* 13 (No. 29)
Read 2ª* *Mar* 20
Committee*; Report *Mar* 21
Read 3ª* *Mar* 23
Royal Assent *Mar* 27 [39 *Vict.* c. 5]

TEMPLE, Right Hon. W. F. COWPER-, *Hants, S.*
Commons, 2R. [227] 535; Comm. [229] 1230, 1386; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1387, 1393; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1525, 1529; *cl.* 12, 1532; Consid. [230] 134; Amendt. 138
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1238; *add. cl.* 1996; Amendt. 2008, 2009
Epping Forest—Forest Commissioners' Scheme, [230] 1624
Fine Arts, Motion for an Address, [229] 289
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 996, 1020
Merchant Shipping, Consid. *add. cl.* [229] 1061
National Gallery—New Buildings, [229] 1422
New Forest—Stoneycross, Inclosure at, [229] 34, 1425
Windward Islands—Federation, [228] 1178

TEMPLETOWN, Viscount
Metropolis — Northumberland Avenue, [228] 1394

Tenant Right at the Expiration of Leases Bill (*Mr. Mulholland, Lord Arthur Edwin Hill-Trevor, The Marquess of Hamilton, Captain Corry, Mr. Chaine*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 21 [Bill 84]
2R. *May* 2, [228] 2040 [House counted out]
2R. [Dropped]

TENNANT, Mr. R., *Leeds*
Army — Majors of Cavalry, Supernumerary, [228] 74
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1179
Factory and Workshop Acts, Res. [230] 985; Report, [231] 550
Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1677

Thames Valley Drainage — Report of Colonel Cox
Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 10, [228] 1484
Report—*P.P.* 184

THORNHILL, Mr. T., *Suffolk, W.*
Barbadoes—Riots, The, [228] 1628, 1834; [230] 1281; [231] 702;—Governor Hennessy, [229] 155
  Social and Political Condition, [231] 48
Criminal Law—Jermyn Street, Outrages in, [230] 1281
Windward Islands—Disturbances, [229] 367

Toll Bridges (*River Thames*)
Select Committee appointed, "to take into consideration the freeing of the remaining Tollpaying Bridges over the Thames, and the most equitable mode of raising the necessary funds, and to report to the House" (*Mr. Alderman M'Arthur*) *Mar* 31
And, on *April* 10, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Stansfeld (Chairman), Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Grantham, Mr. F. Harrison, Sir James Hogg, Mr. William Holms, Colonel Jervis, Sir James Lawrence, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Puleston, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Serjeant Spinks, and Mr. Young
Report of Select Comm. *May* 26 *P.P.* 244

Toll Bridges (River Thames) Bill
(*Mr. Alderman M'Arthur, Sir James Clarke Lawrence, Mr. Forsyth, Sir Henry Peek, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Sir Charles Russell*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 16 [Bill 77]
Read 2° *, and referred to a Select Committee *June* 19
And, on *June* 22, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Stansfeld (Chairman), nominated by the Committee of Selection, Mr. Coope, Mr. Cubitt, Sir James Hogg, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Hanbury, Mr. Ralli, Mr. Rodwell, and Mr. Wait, nominated by the Committee of Selection
Report of Select Comm. *June* 30 *P.P.* 328
Question, Sir Henry Peek; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 20, [230] 1624; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Lord Mayor, 1628
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read *July* 20, 1679; after short debate, Order discharged
Bill, as amended, referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills to inquire whether the Amendments involve any infraction of the Standing Orders of the House; leave given to the Examiner to sit and proceed forthwith [Bill 219]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 14

Torr, Mr. J., *Liverpool*
County Palatine of Lancaster (Clerk of the Peace), 2R. [227] 336
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [230] 1530; *add. cl.* 1538, 1539

Torrens, Mr. W. T. M., *Finsbury*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Consid. *cl.* 6, [231] 762
Art Library, South Kensington, [229] 104
British Museum—Salaries, [228] 1576
Treaty of Vienna, 1815—Polish Language, [231] 820

Towns Rating (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Butt, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Meldon*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 41]
2R. [Dropped]

Tracy, Hon. C. R. D. Hanbury-, *Montgomery, &c.*
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
Circular Ships, [227] 1798
Commanders — Order in Council, 1864, [229] 104
Detached Squadron, [228] 171
Dockyards, &c.—Foreign Officers, Admission of, [229] 1348
Naval Interpreters, [228] 968, 1327
Navigating Officers, [229] 2012
Retired Naval Commanders, [231] 818
Navy—Flogging, Punishment of, Res. Amendt. [230] 163
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," Loss of the, Motion for a Paper, [227] 1064
Navy—Navigation of Her Majesty's Ships, Res. [228] 1635
Navy—Ships of War, Res. [229] 241
Navy Estimates—Half Pay, &c. [230] 475
Miscellaneous Services, Amendt. [230] 473
Seamen and Marines, [228] 1536

Trade Marks Registration Act, 1875
Question, Mr. Hermon; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 4, [229] 40

Trade Marks Registration Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 16 (No. 121)
Read 2ª * *June* 20
Committee *; Report *June* 22
Read 3ª * *June* 23
Commons Amendts. (No. 173)
c. Read 1° * *June* 29 [Bill 217]
Read 2° * *July* 4
Committee *; Report *July* 6
Considered * *July* 11
Read 3° * *July* 13
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 33]

Trade Union Act (1871) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Mundella, Mr. Thomas Brassey, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Morley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 1 [Bill 92]
Read 2° * *Mar* 27
Committee *; Report *April* 5
Read 3° * *May* 3
Lords Amendts. [Bill 208]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Aberdare*) *May* 5 (No. 73)
Read 2ª, after short debate *May* 26, [229] 1259
Committee *; Report *May* 29 (No. 98)
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 1
Read 3ª * *June* 13
Royal Assent *June* 30 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 22]

Trade Union Act, 1871—*Legislation*
Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 22, [227] 678

Training Schools and Ships Bill
(*Captain Pim, Mr. Coope*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 13]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 26

Tralee Savings Bank
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the case of the depositors in the late Tralee Savings Bank" (*The O'Donoghue*) *Mar* 7, [227] 1582; after short debate, Question put; A. 54, N. 133: M. 79

Tralee Savings Bank Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 27 [Bill 275]
Read 2°* *July* 31
Committee*; Report *August* 2
Read 3°* *August* 3
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *August* 4 (No. 202)
Read 2ª* *August* 8
Committee*; Report *August* 9
Read 3ª* *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cciv]

Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment (Dublin) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 22 [Bill 207]
Read 2°*, and referred to a Select Committee *August* 2
And, on *August* 3, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland (Chairman), Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Gibson; Mr. Cotes, and Mr. Freshfield nominated by the Committee of Selection
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 5
Read 3°* *August* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *August* 8 (No. 213)
Read 2ª* *August* 10
Committee*; Report *August* 11
Read 3ª* *August* 12
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 65]

Tramways Order Confirmation (Wantage) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *April* 28 (No. 61)
Read 2ª* *May* 5
Committee*; Report *May* 15
Read 3ª* *May* 16
c. Read 1°* *May* 18 [Bill 157]
Read 2°* *May* 22
Committee*; Report *June* 1
Read 3°* *June* 12
l. Royal Assent *June* 27 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 42]

Tramways Orders Confirmation (Bristol, &c.) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *April* 28 (No. 60)
Read 2ª* *May* 5
Committee*; Report *June* 1
Committee* (*on re-comm.*) *June* 15
Report* *June* 16
Read 3ª* *June* 19
c. Read 1°* *June* 21 [Bill 203]
Read 2°* *June* 26
Committee*; Report *July* 6
Considered* *July* 7
Read 3°* *July* 10
l. Royal Assent *July* 24 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. cl]

Treasury Solicitor Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 10 [Bill 128]
Read 2°* *April* 24
Committee*; Report *May* 4
Read 3°* *May* 5
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *May* 8 (No. 76)
Read 2ª* *May* 29
Committee*; Report *May* 30
Read 3ª* *June* 1
Royal Assent *June* 27 [39 & 40 *Vict* c. 18]

Treaties respecting Non-European Countries—Hertslet's "Map of Europe by Treaty"
Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 3, [231] 416; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 4, 517

Treaty of Vienna, 1815—*The Polish Language*
Question, Mr. W. M. Torrens; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 8, [231] 820

Treaty of Washington—Canadian Fishery Commission
Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 22, [230] 257

TREMAYNE, Mr. J., *Cornwall, E.*
Unreformed Municipal Corporations (England and Wales)—Royal Commission, [228] 479

TREVELYAN, Mr. G. O., *Hawick, &c.*
Electoral System—Borough and County Constituencies, Res. [229] 1442, 1458, 1491
Lisbon Tramways Company — Twycross v. Grant—Personal Explanation, [230] 1485
Poor Law (Scotland), Comm. [230] 516

Turkey
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Alleged Atrocities in Bulgaria
230] Question, Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *June* 26, 424; Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *July* 10, 1168; Question, Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster *July* 10, 1180; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. W. E. Forster*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 17, 1476; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 21, 1697; Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 27, 1961
231] Observations, Mr. Anderson; Reply, Mr. Bourke; debate thereon *August* 7, 721; Questions, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Lowe; Answers, Mr. Bourke, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 9, 875; Observations, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Reply, Mr. Bourke; debate thereon *August* 11, 1078

[*cont.*

Turkey—cont.

State of Bulgaria, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *August* 11, [231] 1059

Insurrectionary Provinces

230] Questions, Observations, The Duke of Argyll, Earl De La Warr; Reply, The Earl of Derby *June* 26, 385; Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 27, 500; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 30, 737; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 27, 1970

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Question, Mr. Bruce; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 17, [227] 406; Question, Mr. Bruce; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 10, [230] 1170;—*Consular Memorandum on Herzegovina,* Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 17, [230] 1480

Reported Outbreak of Hostilities, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 3, [230] 873

Servia

Declaration of War by Servia, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *June* 29, [230] 610; Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, Mr. Disraeli, 623

Russian Officers in the Servian Army, Question, The Earl of Camperdown; Answer, The Earl of Derby *July* 3, [230] 823

The Servian Invasion, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 4, [230] 950

The Insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Orders of the Day postponed *July* 31, [231] 122

Moved, "That this House is of opinion that Her Majesty's Government, while maintaining the respect due to existing Treaties, should exercise all their influence with the view of securing the common welfare and equal treatment of the various races and religions which are under the authority of the Sublime Porte" (*Mr. Bruce*), 126

Amendt. to leave out from "opinion that" and add "it is the duty of the British Government, as one of the powers which, under the Treaty of 1856, guaranteed the independence of the Ottoman Empire, in any steps that may be taken with a view to the restoration of peace between the Ottoman Porte and her Slavonic provinces to obtain for those provinces adequate and effectual guarantees for good and impartial government irrespective of race or creed" (*Mr. Forsyth*), *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Correspondence . . *P.P.* [1475, 1531]

Salonica, Murder of the Consuls at

Question, Earl De La Warr; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 18, [229] 914; Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. Hunt, 925; Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 23, 1113; Questions, Earl De La Warr, Earl Granville; Answers, The Earl of Derby *July* 3, [230] 847;—*The Correspondence,* Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Bourke; short debate thereon *July* 24, 1820 *P.P.* 1547

Turkey—cont.

The Eastern Question

Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answers, Mr. T. C. Bruce, Mr. Disraeli *June* 22, [230] 255; Ministerial Statement, Mr. Disraeli; Observations, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 22, 265; Observations, Mr. E. Jenkins; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *July* 3, 873; Moved, "That the House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Edward Jenkins*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Official Declarations—Deputations, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 24, [230] 1813

Second Note of the Three Powers (*The Berlin Memorandum*), Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Derby *May* 22, [229] 1000;—*The Despatch,* Question, Observations, Lord Campbell; Reply, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *June* 1, 1510; Question, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *June* 9, 1605

The Berlin Conference, Question, Mr. Bruce; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 22, [229] 1053

The Naval Force in Turkish Waters, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 27, [230] 1960

The Papers, Question, Colonel Mure; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 30, [229] 1423; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 4, [230] 946; Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 10, 1174; Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Derby *July* 24, 1765

The Treaty of Paris, 1856—*Integrity of the Ottoman Empire,* Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr; Reply, The Earl of Derby *June* 15, [229] 1888

Turkish Finance

Question, Mr. Hamond; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 29, [229] 1354

Loans of 1854 *and* 1855, Question, Mr. W. Gordon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 28, [228] 698; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 14, [231] 1203

Loans of 1854 *and* 1871, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, [231] 966

The Guaranteed Loan of 1855, Question, Mr. W. Gordon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 17, [227] 398; Question, Colonel Mure; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 3, [231] 423

Turkey — Firman on Reforms — The Andrassy Note

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of the firman on reforms which has lately come from the Sublime Porte, and of the Austrian note by which it has been followed (*The Lord Campbell*) *Mar* 6, [227] 1405; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Turkey—The Berlin Memorandum
Moved, " That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for extracts of any recent correspondence which has taken place between Her Majesty's Government and that of Berlin on the subject of the insurrection of European Turkey" (*The Lord Campbell*) *June* 26, [230] 395 ; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Turkey—Treaties of 1856
Moved, " That this House, anxious for the welfare of the various races subject to the Ottoman Empire, and for an improved administration of their Government, is ready to support the measures which become necessary for upholding the Treaties of 30th March and 15th April, 1856" (*The Lord Campbell*) *July* 31, [231] 74 ; after long debate, Previous Question moved ; resolved in the negative
Correspondence . . . . . *P.P.* 1558

Turkish Debt, The—The Loan of 1854
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 4, To leave out from "That," and add " an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will direct that a communication may be made to the President of the French Republic, in order to ascertain whether the French Government will unite with the Government of Her Majesty in pressing upon the Government of Turkey the complete fulfilment of the conditions upon which the Turkish Loan of 1854 was subscribed for" (*Mr. Russell Gurney*) *v.*, [230] 1729 ; Question proposed, " That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn *P.P.* 1424

Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
Assassination of the Turkish Ministers, Question, Mr. John Bright ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 16, [229] 1975
Ministerial Statement, Question, The Marquess of Hartington ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 1, [229] 1521 ; Ministerial Statement, Mr. Disraeli *July* 17, [230] 1486
Montenegro, Question, Mr. Butler-Johnstone ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 5, [229] 106
Reported Deposition of the Sultan, Question, Earl De La Warr ; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 30, [229] 1416
Roumania, Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke ; Answers, Mr. Bourke *July* 18, [230] 1527
The Geneva Convention, Question, Captain Nolan ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *August* 7, [231] 701
The Plague in Bagdad, Question, Mr. Twells ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 26, [230] 427
The War in the East—The Recess, Question, Mr. Monk ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *August* 10, [231] 970
Turkey and Greece—Proposed Settlement of Circassians, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 31, [231] 121

TURNOR, Mr. E., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Res. [227] 2059

Turnpike Acts Continuance
Select Committee appointed, " to inquire into the Sixth Schedule of ' The Annual Turnpike Acts Continuance Act, 1875,'' (*Mr. Salt*) *Feb* 24, [227] 903
And, on *Feb* 25, Committee nominated as follows :—Lord George Cavendish (Chairman), Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. W. W. Beach, Mr. Wentworth Beaumont, Mr. George Clive, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Salt, Mr. Spencer Stanhope, and Lord Henry Thynne
Instruction to the Committee
Report of Select Comm. . . . . *P.P.* 241

Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 26 [Bill 209]
Read 2° * *July* 6
Committee * ; Report *July* 10
Considered * *July* 11
Read 3° * *July* 13
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Jersey*) *July* 14 (No. 175)
Read 2ª * *July* 24
Committee * ; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 39]

Turnpike Roads Trusts—Shrewsbury and Holyhead Road
Question, Mr. Leighton ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 9, [229] 263

TWELLS, Mr. P., *London*
Turkey—Bagdad, Plague in, [230] 427

Union of Benefices Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bishop of Exeter*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *May* 1 (No. 64)
Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 16, [229] 755
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day six months") (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) ; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Original Motion agreed to ; Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee
And, on *May* 29, the Lords following were named of the Committee :—M. Salisbury, E. Devon, E. Stanhope, E. Chichester, E. Powis, E. Nelson, E. Kimberley, V. Cardwell, L. Bp. Exeter, L. Bp. Oxford, L. Colchester, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Hartismere, L. Coleridge
Report of Select Comm.* *June* 27 (No. 146)
Bill reported * *June* 27 (No. 147)
Committee *July* 4, [230] 938
Report * *July* 10
Read 3ª * *July* 11
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. A. Mills*) *July* 14 [Bill 248]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 3

Union Rating (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Butt, Mr. Downing, Mr. Sheil*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 10 [Bill 58]
Bill withdrawn * *Mar* 27

United Parishes (Scotland) Bill

(*Mr. Dalrymple, Colonel Alexander, Mr. M'Lagan*)

c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 11 [Bill 62]
Read 2° *Feb* 21, [227] 661
Committee* ; Report *Feb* 22
Read 3°* *Feb* 24

l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Steward*) *Feb* 25 (No. 18)
Question, Observations, The Earl of Minto ; Reply, Earl Beauchamp *Mar* 16, [228] 57
Read 2ª* *Mar* 28
Committee* *Mar* 31
Report* *April* 3
Read 3ª* *April* 4
Royal Assent *June* 1 [39 *Vict* c. 11]

United States

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

"*Alabama*" *Award, The*, Question, Mr. Elliot; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 10, [228] 1481 ; Question, Mr. Bates ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 18, [229] 927

Emma Mine, The — Criminal Proceedings, Question, Mr. Callan ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 29, [229] 1352

Extradition

Case of Caldwell, Question, Sir William Harcourt ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 4, [230] 946

228] *Case of Ezra Winslow*, Question, Sir Henry
James ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 1,
1909 ; Questions, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Pule-
ston ; Answers, The Attorney General, Mr.
229] Bourke *May* 4, 44 ; Question, Sir William
Harcourt ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 16, 777 ;
Question, Sir William Harcourt ; Answer,
Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 23, 1113 ; Ques-
tion, Sir Henry James ; Answer, Mr. Bourke
June 12, 1668 ;—*The Papers*, Question,
Earl Granville ; Answer, The Earl of Derby
May 4, 33 ;—*Notice of Abrogation*, Question,
Sir H. Drummond Wolff ; Answer, Mr. Bourke
May 5, 106

Return of Cases, Question, Sir William Harcourt ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 3, [231] 424

The Extradition Treaty, Question, Mr. Staveley Hill ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 27, [230] 499 ;—*Arrangement of Public Business*, Question, Sir William Harcourt ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 27, 1968

Notice postponed, Observations, Sir William Harcourt *August* 10, [231] 977

Parl. Papers—

Correspondence respecting Extradition	[1482, 1526]
Case of Burley	[1528]
Case of Caldwell	[1529]
Return of Cases	[1557]

General Schenck, Question, Mr. Anderson ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 10, [227] 1798

International Exhibition, Philadelphia—The British Commission, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 17, [230] 1479

The Indian War, Question, Sir Edward Watkin ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 21, [230] 1697

United States—Extradition

Question, Observations, Earl Granville ; Reply, The Earl of Derby *July* 20, [230] 1617

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for further Correspondence respecting Extradition" (*Earl Granville*) *July* 24, [230] 1768 ; after long debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *August* 3, [231] 371 ; after further long debate, Motion withdrawn

University Education (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. Butt, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. MacCarthy, Mr. Sullivan*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Butt*) *May* 16, [229] 805 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* [Bill 150]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 9

University of Cambridge Bill

(*Mr. Spencer Walpole, Mr. Secretary Cross, Lord John Manners*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Spencer Walpole*) *May* 16, [229] 829 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* *May* 16 [Bill 151]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 6, [230] 1050

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in view of the large legislative powers entrusted to the University of Cambridge Commissioners by this Bill, this House is of opinion that the Bill does not sufficiently declare or define the principles and scope of the changes which such Commissioners are empowered to make in that University and the Colleges therein" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn* *July* 31

University of Cambridge—Legislation

Question, Observations, Earl Granville ; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *Mar* 23, [228] 466

University of Oxford Bill [H.L.]

Formerly—

Oxford University Bill

(*The Marquess of Salisbury*)

l. Presented ; read 1ª, after short debate *Feb* 24, [227] 791 (No. 16)

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 9, 1661

Amendt. to leave out from ("That,") and insert ("this House regrets that any legislation should be undertaken in reference to either University, except after a more extended and comprehensive inquiry than fell within the scope of the recent Royal Commission") (*The Lord Colchester*) ; after long debate, on Question, "That the words, &c.?" resolved in the affirmative ; Bill read 2ª

[*cont.*

University of Oxford Bill—cont.

228] *The Commissioners*, Question, Observations, The Marquess of Lansdowne; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *Mar* 20, 261
. Observations, Question, The Earl of Airlie; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *Mar* 21, 348
. Notice of Amendments, The Marquess of Salisbury *Mar* 27, 598
. Committee; Report, after short debate; Bill re-committed *Mar* 30, 820
. Committee (*on re-comm.*) after short debate *Mar* 31, 926
. Committee (*on re-comm.*) *April* 6, 1302
. Report *May* 2, 1949 (No. 45)
Read 3ª *May* 5, [229] 101; after short debate, Bill passed (Nos. 51, 68)
c. Read 1º* *May* 8 [Bill 146]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *June* 12, 1712
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in view of the large legislative powers entrusted to the University of Oxford Commissioners by this Bill, this House is of opinion that the Bill does not sufficiently declare or define the principles and scope of the changes which such Commissioners are empowered to make in that University and the colleges therein" (*Mr. Osborne Morgan*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Grant Duff*); Motion withdrawn; Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2º
Bill withdrawn* *July* 31

Vaccination Acts
Abel's Case, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 12, [231] 1155
Boards of Guardians, Question, Sir Charles Forster; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 4, [230] 945;—*The Keighley Board of Guardians*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 7, [230] 1139
Milner's Case, Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 23, [228] 477
Pearce's Case, Questions, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 25, [230] 1883; *August* 8, [231] 819
Prosecutions, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 16, [228] 62

Parl. Papers—
Vaccination Prosecutions (Keighley Union)—Letter 436
Prosecutions (Letter from Local Government Board) 110

Valuation Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) *Feb* 11, [227] 239; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1º* [Bill 59]
Surveyors of Taxes, Question, Mr. E. Hubbard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 27, [228] 1760
Bill withdrawn* *July* 26

Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act (1869) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Twells*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. J. G. Hubbard*) *Feb* 16, [227] 371; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1º* [Bill 74]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *Feb* 29, 1162
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day month" (*Mr. Goldsmid*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
[House counted out]
Bill withdrawn, after short debate *July* 26, [230] 1939

VERNER, Mr. E. W., *Armagh Co.*
Jurors Qualification (Ireland), Comm. Schedule 1, [230] 273
Royal Irish Constabulary (Mr. John Croker), Res. [229] 1442

VIVIAN, Mr. H. Hussey, *Glamorganshire*
Navy—Coal, [227] 1413

Vivisection
Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 23, [228] 476
Legislation, Observations, Question, Lord Henniker; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 14, [227] 2008
Report of the Royal Commission, Question, Mr. Stansfeld; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 24, [227] 819
Report of the Commission—*P.P.* [1397]

WADDY, Mr. S. D., *Barnstaple*
Births and Deaths, Registration of—Medical Certificates, [227] 558
Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of [229] 1049
Standridge, The Convict, [229] 207
Elementary Education, Comm. [230] 1265, 1266, 1267
Endowed Schools Commissioners—Exeter Endowed Schools Scheme, [227] 134
Fugitive Slave Circulars, Res. [227] 842
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 1623
Public Health—Medical Officer to the Privy Council, [229] 1517
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. Amendt. [227] 1847; [229] 1311, 1332
Local Government Board, &c. [227] 518
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Official Referees, [227] 302, 303; [229] 774

WAIT, Mr. W. K., *Gloucester*
Army—Militia, Adjutants of, [227] 674
Pensions, Payment of, [230] 1810
Quartermasters, [227] 814
Barbadoes—Riots, [229] 265; [230] 1811
Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [230] 1416
Vivisection—Legislation, [228] 476
Windward Islands—Disturbances, [229] 367

Wales, The Prince of— Visit of H.R.H. to India—The Expenditure
Question, Mr. C. B. Denison; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 11, [231] 1077

WALPOLE, Right Hon. Spencer H., *Cambridge University*
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [227] 364
Parliament—Business of the House, [227] 500
Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1436
Supply—British Museum, [231] 264
University of Cambridge, Leave, [229] 829, 836; 2R. [230] 1050, 1115

WALSH, Hon. A., *Radnorshire*
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 2, [229] 1390; *add. cl.* 1570

WALTER, Mr. J., *Berkshire*
Burial Services in Parish Churchyards, Res. [227] 1349
Commons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [229] 1526
Elementary Education, 2R. [229] 1952; Comm. *cl.* 14, [230] 1451
Poor Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 1775, 1778; Consid. [230] 478

WARD, Dr. M. F., *Galway*
Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland), 2R. [228] 1886
Army Medical Officers, [230] 426
Army— Medical Service — Civilian Doctors, [227] 401
Army Estimates — Medical Establishments, [227] 1488
Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 428, 464
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. Amendt. [231] 894; Consid. *cl.* 3, 1148
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [229] 1377
Education Code — Subjects, Choice of, Res. [227] 1812
Elementary Education, Comm. *add. cl.* [230] 1848; Consid. *cl.* 14, [231] 491, 529
India—Behar, Famine in, [230] 1046, 1047
India—Bengal Famine, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1858
Inland Revenue—Excise—Blending of Irish Whiskey, Motion for a Select Committee, [228] 1208
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Equity Courts — Lord Justice Christian, Personal Explanation, [227] 2017
  Landed Estates Court — Second Judge, Appointment of, [228] 70
  Magistrates—Orange Meeting, Speech at, [229] 172
  Poor Law—South Dublin Workhouse, [230] 1812
  Primary Education, [227] 1122
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [228] 742
Ireland—Common Pleas—Resignation of Chief Justice, Motion for a Paper, [231] 1233
Ireland—National School Teachers Act, 1875, Res. [228] 238
Irish Political Prisoners, Res. [231] 311
Medical Act Amendment (Foreign Universities), 2R. [230] 1008

WARD, Dr. M. F.—*cont.*
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *add. cl.* [229] 75, 231
Merchant Shipping Acts—"Royal Sovereign," Scurvy on board the, [227] 302
  Scurvy, Cases of, [227] 1414, 1715
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [227] 112
  Public Business, Arrangement of, [230] 1639
Parliament—Referees on Private Bills, Nomination of Select Committee, Amendt. [227] 1496
Post Office—Telegraph Messages, [231] 1068
Supply—Local Government Board, &c. [227] 518
  Public Education, Ireland, [231] 278
  Public Works in Ireland, [227] 1845
  Revenue Departments, [228] 1878
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [230] 354, 364
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [228] 1702

War Department Post Office (Remuneration, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Secretary Hardy, Lord John Manners*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 22 [Bill 206]
Read 2° * *June* 26
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 6; debate adjourned
Debate resumed *August* 8, [231] 856
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Mellor*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee; Report
Read 3° * *August* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *August* 10
Read 2ª * *August* 11 (No. 219)
Committee *; Report *August* 12
Read 3ª * *August* 14
Royal Assent *August* 15 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 68]

WATERLOW, Sir S. H., *Maidstone*
Borough Boundaries, [227] 2010
Crossed Cheques, 3R. [231] 1216; Re-comm; *cl.* 12, 1220
Metropolitan Board of Works, 2R. Amendt. [227] 806

WATKIN, Sir E. W., *Hythe*
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. [230] 1158
Army—Military Prisoners—Gunner Charlton, Case of, [227] 256; [230] 1962; [231] 874, 875
County Palatine of Lancaster (Clerk of the Peace), 2R. [227] 337
Elementary Education Act, 1870—Science in Elementary Schools, [228] 1405
Harbours of Refuge—Dungeness, [227] 553
Mercantile Marine — Wrecks off Dungeness, [229] 1356
Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 14, [228] 1584
Metropolitan Railway, 2R. [227] 807, 810, 1119, 1120

[*cont.*

Watkin, Sir E. W.—*cont.*
  Navy—Henwood, Mr. Charles Frederick, Petition of, [229] 1038; Motion for a Select Committee, 1613
  Offences against the Person, Comm. [227] 332, 1190
  Parliament — Order — Private Bills—Solicitation of Votes, Explanation, [230] 860, 861, 863, 1135
  Parliament—Private Bills—Canvassing in the House, Res. [227] 1491, 1495
  Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [227] 1593
  Turkey—Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [230] 1185
  United States—Indian War, [230] 1697

Watney, Mr. J., *Surrey, E.*
  Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 16, [230] 1497
  Poor Law—Out-door Relief—Charlotte Hammond, Case of, [229] 1351

Waste Lands and Peasants Dwellings (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Biggar, Mr. Cowen, Mr. O'Sullivan*)
c. Ordered * *July* 17
  Read 1° * *August* 1 [Bill 280]
  2R. [Dropped]

Waste Lands (Ireland) Reclamation Bill
(*Mr. Parnell, Mr. MacCarthy, Captain Nolan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 12]
  Bill withdrawn * *June* 28

Waterford, New Ross, and Wexford Junction Railway (Sale) Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 12 [Bill 148]
  Referred to Select Committee *May* 29
  Ordered, That the Select Committee do consist of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two to be nominated by the Committee of Selection
  Ordered, That Mr. Ridley, Captain Hood, and Mr. Blennerhassett be Members of the Committee (*Mr. William Henry Smith*) *June* 1
  Report of Select Comm. *June* 16
  Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 19
  Read 3° * *June* 20 [Bill 198]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*), and referred to the Examiners *June* 22 (No. 133)
  Read 2ª * *July* 7
  Committee *; Report *July* 10
  Read 3ª * *July* 11
  Royal Assent *July* 13 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 98]

Waveney, Lord
  Army Mobilization, [231] 226
  Elementary Education, 2R. [231] 814
  Grand Juries (Ireland), Res. [229] 1412
  Languages (India)—Indian Civil Service, [230] 1469
  Municipal Privileges (Ireland), 2R. [231] 932
  Notices to Quit (Ireland), 2R. [230] 1695
  Royal Titles, 2R. [228] 849
  Turkey—Second Note of the Three Powers—The Despatch, [229] 1512
  Turkey—Treaties of 1856, Res. [231] 110

WAYS AND MEANS
Miscellaneous Questions
  Customs (Out-door Department)—The Playfair Commission, Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 23, [229] 1115;—*Inland Revenue (Out-door Department)—The Playfair Commission*, Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 16, [229] 1973
  Duties on Offices of Profit, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 4, [229] 48
  Friendly and Building Societies—Fees on Certificates, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 3, [228] 1096
  Friendly Societies Act, 1875 — *Certificates of Deaths*, Question, Mr. Waddy; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 21, [227] 558; Question, Mr. Ashbury; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 16, [228] 71; Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 3, 1096; Question, Mr. W. Holms; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 6, 1325
  Game Licences, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 30, [229] 1419
  Grocers' Wine and Spirit Licences, Question, Mr. Bolckow; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 7, [227] 1568
  Income Tax, The—Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1875, Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 15, [229] 668
  Inland Revenue—Armorial Bearings, Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 13, [230] 1391
  Inland Revenue Department — Civil Service Inquiry Commission, Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 21, [227] 556; Question, Mr. Massey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 7, [231] 695;—*Extra Pay*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 13, [230] 1390;—*The Treasury Minute*, Explanation, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 3, [230] 858
  Inland Revenue—Out-door Excise Establishment, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 26, [230] 422
  Malt Tax, The, Question, Mr. Storer; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 16, [229] 1973
  Public Health Act, 1875—*The Proxy Stamp*, Question, Mr. Coope; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 7, [228] 1410
  Railway Passenger Duty, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 17, [230] 1474;—*The London Chatham and Dover, and the London Brighton and South Coast Railways*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 11, [231] 1075
  Stamp Duty on Bankers' Deposits—See title *Bankers' Deposits—Financial Panics*
  Taxes on Casual Servants, Question, Sir Henry Peek; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 17, [227] 400

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—*cont.*

The Stamp Act—Marine Policies—"Sassoon v. Harris," Question, Mr. Grieve ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 22, [227] 679

WAYS AND MEANS

Resolved, "That this House will, upon Friday, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty" *Feb* 9

[See titles *Consolidated Fund* (£4,080,000) *Bill—Exchequer Bonds* (£4,080,000) *Bill*]

228] Considered in Committee *Mar* 20, 345—(£1,029,550 5*s.* 1*d.*) Consolidated Fund (Deficiencies, 1875-6)—(£9,000,000) Consolidated Fund (Services, 1876-7)—Resolutions reported *Mar* 21

Considered in Committee *April* 3, 1100—

Financial Statement of The Chancellor of the Exchequer on moving the First Resolution,

"That there shall be charged, collected, and paid for one year, commencing on the 6th day of April, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six, in respect of all Property, Profits, and Gains mentioned or described as chargeable in the Act of the sixteenth and seventeenth years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter thirty-four, the following Duties of Income Tax (that is to say):

For every Twenty Shillings of the annual value or amount of all such Property, Profits, and Gains chargeable under Schedules (A) (C) (D) or (E) of the said Act, the Duty of Three Pence ;

And For every Twenty Shillings of the annual value of the occupation of Lands, Tenements, Hereditaments, and Heritages chargeable under Schedule (B) of this Act :—

In England, the Duty of One Penny Halfpenny ; and

In Scotland and Ireland respectively, the Duty of One Penny Farthing"

After debate, Committee—R.P.

The Financial Statement—Abatements from Income Tax, Question, Mr. Whitwell ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 6, 1324

Considered in Committee *April* 6, 1353—Resolution [April 3] again proposed

Amendt. proposed [that the Duties be 2*d.*, 1*d.* and 1*d.* respectively] (*Mr. Charles Lewis*) ; after debate, Question put ; A. 52, N. 113 ; M. 61

Original Question agreed to

Other Resolutions moved, and agreed to

Resolutions reported, and agreed to *April* 7 ; Bill ordered (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*) ; presented, and read 1° [Bill 124]

[See title—*Customs and Inland Revenue Bill*]

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—*cont.*

229] Considered in Committee *May* 22, 1082

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending the 31st day of March 1877, the sum of £11,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom"

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. O'Sullivan*) ; Question put ; A. 15, N. 87 ; M. 72

Original Question again proposed ; Moved, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Parnell*) ; Motion withdrawn

Original Question put, and agreed to

Resolution reported *May* 23

231] Considered in Committee *August* 5

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1877, the sum of £28,703,043 be granted, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom

Resolution reported *August* 7, 758

After short debate, Resolution agreed to

SUMMARY.

Ways and Means.

Grants out of the Consolidated Fund.

	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
For the service of the years ending 31st March 1875 and 1876;						
Under Act 39 Vic. cap. 2				4,080,000	0	0
Under Act 39 Vic. cap. 4				1,029,550	5	1
For the service of the year ending 31st March 1877; viz.						
Under Act 39 Vic. cap. 4	9,000,000	0	0			
Under Act 39 Vic. cap. 15	11,000,000	0	0			
Under this Act ...	28,703,043	0	0			
				48,703,043	0	0
Total ...				£53,812,593	5	1

Ways and Means—Customs—The Wine Duties

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present system of levying the Customs Duties on Wine" (*Mr. William Cartwright*) *Mar* 7, [227] 1569 ; after short debate, Question put, and negatived

[See title *Civil Service Inquiry Commission*]

WILMOT, Sir J. E.—*cont.*
- Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 1159 ; *cl.* 6, 1161 ; Consid. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [231] 765
- Army—Militia Surgeons—Regulations, [227] 557
- Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [228] 720
- Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 451
- Convicted Children, Comm. [230] 1029
- Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [230] 1934
- Elementary Education, Comm. *cl.* 8, [230] 1530 ; *add. cl.* [231] 16
- Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [229] 1172
- European Assurance Society Arbitration, [229] 1038
- Harbours of Refuge—North-East Coast, [230] 1972 ; Res. [231] 27
- Homicide Law Amendment, Leave, [227] 373 ; 2R. 1659
- Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [230] 783
- Jurors Qualification (Ireland), 3R. [230] 339
- Lunatics, Committal and Treatment of, [230] 1167
- Merchant Shipping, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [228] 899 ; Consid. *cl.* 4, [229] 1067
- Metropolitan Police—Helmets, [230] 1819
- Navy—Royal Marines, [228] 1524
- Offences against the Person, Comm. [227] 333
- Parliament—Public Petition from a Foreign Town — Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), [228] 1321 ; Res. 1416
- Public Schools Act, 1868, Res. [228] 1449
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1365 ; [231] 436

WILSON, Mr. C. H., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
- Army—Recruiting, [227] 1795
- Egypt — Suez Canal Shares — Commissions, [227] 1120
- Mercantile Marine—Pensions to Seamen, Res. [227] 1830

227] Merchant Shipping, 2R. 451
228] Comm. *cl.* 3, 895, 907 ; *cl.* 4, 912 ; *cl.* 5,
. 1155 ; *cl.* 16, 1798 ; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1884 ;
. *cl.* 27, 1915 ; Amendt. 1916, 1918 ; *add. cl.*
. 1937 ; Amendt. 1947
229] *add. cl.* 55, 57, 64, 217, 230 ; Consid. *add. cl.*
. 1060 ; *cl.* 11, 1068 ; *cl.* 18, 1072, 1076 ;
. *cl.* 22, Amendt. 1079 ; 3R. 1335

- Merchant Shipping Acts—Unseaworthy Ships—Foreign Nations, [227] 1419
- Merchant Shipping Acts—Load Line Return, [227] 1707
- Municipal Officers Superannuation, Comm. [227] 1604

WINMARLEIGH, Lord
- County Palatine of Lancaster (Clerk of the Peace), 2R. [228] 560
- Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [229] 1033 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [230] 109, 119
- India—Indian Tariff, [227] 1998
- Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.), Comm. [230] 1522
- Noxious Vapours, [227] 790
- Sulphurous Acid, &c., Address for a Royal Commission, [228] 606

Winter Assizes Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 12 [Bill 245]
Read 2° * *July* 17
Committee *—R.P. *July* 25
Committee * ; Report *July* 26
Considered * *July* 27
Read 3° * *July* 28
Lords Amendts. [Bill 288]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 31
Read 2ª *August* 1, [231] 225 (No. 200)
Committee * *August* 3
Report * *August* 4
Read 3ª * *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 11 [39 & 40 *Vict.* c. 57]

Winter Assizes (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Stacpoole*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *August* 7 [Bill 290]
Read 2° * ; Committee ; Report *August* 9
Bill withdrawn * *August* 11 [Bill 292]

WOLFF, Sir H. D., *Christchurch*
- Bank of England—Loans Act—Suez Canal Shares, [228] 269
- British Museum—The Salaries, [230] 858
- Cruelty to Animals, Consid. *cl.* 3, [231] 1150
- Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Egyptian Finance — Mr. Cave's Report, [228] 699
  - General Kirkham, Imprisonment of, [230] 1477
  - Minister of War in, [227] 266, 1022
  - Suez Canal, [227] 2011 ;—Management, [229] 39, 40, 172, 174 ;—Modification of Dues, [228] 1562, 1567
- Egypt—Egyptian Finance—Mr. Cave's Mission, Res. [231] 648
- House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [228] 552, 554 ; [229] 1598
- Malta, Taxation in, Res. [229] 1983
- Metropolis—Artizans Dwellings Act—Lancashire Court, Bond Street, [231] 1204
  - Street Traffic—Hyde Park, [228] 352
- Parliament—Public Business, [228] 1184
- Parliament — Public Petition from a Foreign Town — Boulogne-sur-Mer (British Consulate), Res. [228] 1417
- Parliament — Strangers, Exclusion of, Res.—Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1819
- Police Superannuation—Special Committee, Report, [227] 814
- Privy Council (Oaths taken by Members, &c.), Address for Returns, [228] 2030
- Royal Titles, Comm. *cl.* 1, [228] 316
- Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 413
- Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [230] 869, 1136, 1815
- Suez Canal Shares, Comm. [231] 834 ; Consid. *cl.* 1, 856
- Supply—British Embassy Houses, &c. Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1595
  - British Seamen Abroad, Relief of Distressed, [229] 1660
  - Embassies and Missions Abroad, Amendt. [228] 1467
  - Report, [227] 997 ; Motion for Adjournment, [229] 1756, 1757
- Supply—Suez Canal Shares, Res. [227] 577

[*cont.*

WOLFF, Sir H. D.—*cont.*
- Treaties respecting Non-European Countries—Hertslet's "Map of Europe by Treaty," [231] 416, 517
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Alleged Atrocities, [231] 1123
  - Eastern Question, [230] 879
  - Insurrectionary Provinces, [230] 1970
- Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Insurrection in, Res. [231] 151
- Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854, Res. [230] 1756
- United States—Extradition Treaty, [229] 106

Women's Disabilities Removal Bill
(*Mr. Forsyth, Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Stansfeld*)
- c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 20]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 26, [228] 1658
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Viscount Folkestone*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 152, N. 239; M. 87
  - Division List, A. and N. 1741
- Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Woolwich—Central Arsenal
- Observations, Major Beaumont; Reply, Lord Eustace Cecil; short debate thereon *April* 7, [228] 1452

Works, Chief Commissioner of—Office of
- Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Ms. Disraeli *August* 7, [231] 695

WYNDHAM, Hon. P. S., *Cumberland, W.*
- Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [231] 920
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 997
- Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [230] 1457
- Parliament — Order — Balloting for Motions, [230] 12, 259
- Royal Titles, Leave, [227] 428; 2R. 1736; Comm. [228] 107
- Turkey—Eastern Question, [230] 881, 882

YEAMAN, Mr. J., *Dundee*
- Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [228] 33
- Coast and Deep Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [228] 444
- Pollution of Rivers, 2R. [230] 1878; 3R. [231] 561
- Poor Law (Scotland), 2R. [229] 260
- Publicans Certificates (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 11, Amendt. [228] 1813
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. [230] 1366
- Seal Fishery — Close Time — International Agreement, [227] 263

YORK, Archbishop of
- Burial, Law of, Res. [229] 626
- Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [227] 1197

YORKE, Mr. J. R., *Gloucestershire, E.*
- Army — Knightsbridge Barracks, [227] 555, 1221, 1294;—The Model, [229] 50
  - Model Cavalry Barracks, [227] 1717
- Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, Res. [227] 1760
- Army Estimates — Works, Buildings, &c. Amendt. [229] 1647
- Brussels International Exhibition, [230] 1886
- Corrupt Practices at Elections Act—Norwich and Boston Election Commission, [229] 1036
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [229] 996
- Exhibition Commissioners of 1851—Financial Position, [230] 254
- International Congress of Hygienie, Brussels, [228] 1483
- Navy — H.M.S. "Thunderer" — Explosion, [230] 1526
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Norwich and Boston, Boroughs of, [229] 1345
  - Order—Debates in the House of Lords, Reference to, [229] 1627, 1629
  - Public Business, [229] 1356
- Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868—Boston Election, [228] 349
- Prisons, Leave, [229] 1550; 2R. [230] 901
- Royal Titles Act Proclamation—Vote of Censure, Res. [229] 374
- Turkey—Eastern Question, [230] 874
- Valuation of Property, Leave, [227] 247

YOUNG, Mr. A. W., *Helston*
- Post Office — Telegraphic Communication in Cornwall, [231] 113

Zanzibar, The Sultan of — Slave Trade (East Africa)
- Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that Her Majesty's Government should invite and assist the Sultan of Zanzibar to take such further steps as may be necessary for the total suppression of the Slave Trade within his dominions, and that at the same time more adequate provision should be made for the care and maintenance of the liberated slaves" (*Sir John Kennaway*) *April* 4, [228] 1216; after debate, Motion agreed to
- *Treaty with the Sultan—The Proclamation—Treaty of* 1839, Question, Mr. Mills; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 16, [228] 72; Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 23, [229] 1117
  - Slave Trade (Supplementary Treaty) [1387]
  - Letter of Dr. Kirk . . . . . [1521]

ERRATA.

In Vol. [229], page 150, line 9 from top, *for* "wasting" *read* "waving."
In Vol. [229], page 152, line 23 from bottom, *for* "local Legislation" *read* "local Legislature."
In Vol. [230], page 751, line 23 from top, *for* "1872" *read* "1782."
In Vol. [230], page 767, line 8 from top, *for* "off" *read* "of."

END OF VOLUME CCXXXI., AND FIFTH AND LAST
VOLUME OF SESSION 1876.